

THE RADICAL.

NOVEMBER, 1868.

LEAD US NOT INTO TEMPTATION.

THREE are no powers of the human mind that exert an influence so overwhelming in all the affairs of men as those of pride and love of approbation. A proper self-respect is necessary to every intelligent individual, and differs essentially in its action from a mere self-conceit. These powers give strength to the strong, and confidence to the weak in intellect. And as great mental powers, mostly combined with great sensitiveness of organization, tend to modesty of thought and deportment by the insight they give into the wonders of creation and the insignificance of human capacity, it results, that the individuals so endowed, rarely reach the higher grades of social position, but yield the way to the boasting, reckless, and self-asserting.

It is not class, nor sect, nor prosperity, that creates pride. These only give *opportunity* for its outward expression. It is to be found among human beings of every condition — strongest in those least civilized, though often best educated intellectually, and in those who have had the animal propensities most cultivated by bad training and example. A barbarous people in its conceit fancies it has attained the highest degree of civilization and enlightenment. It has no capacity of consideration for others. And contentions about religion and politics are sufficient evidence of a low state of human progress.

The world has always been governed by the self-assertors. It is such a good world for them, so credulous, so easily led, so liberal with its contributions! Take the savage — he is a natural criminal, influenced by an enormous self-conceit. A child in intellect, he is a giant

in endurance, where pride sustains him. Take our criminals of a hardened kind — their predominant characteristic is pride ; they are boastful of their deeds, anxious for public attention and notoriety. Take a large amount of what is called aristocracy — pride and vanity are its pillars of strength. In the savage, these powers are a natural outgrowth ; necessary perhaps in that particular development of human existence. In the criminal, they are the result of anti-natal impressions, bad training and example. But in the aristocracy, they are the fruits of a system of educational development, which tends to control or crush out sentiments of humanity, fraternal feeling and social charity, and introduce a cold-hearted and wiley spirit of selfishness and domineering. This will explain why in modern times, among nations the most semi-civilized, acts of barbarity, *coup d'états*, and rebellions, have occurred, directed by princes and nobles, real and pretended, of which the less conceited classes of society would be utterly incapable.

Religion is of two kinds : religion proper, or the being good and doing good, irrespective of all modes of accidental belief ; and religion artificial, or the method of imitating religion by forms, ceremonies, movements, gestures and postures, using idols, creeds, fables, quaint dressings and theatrical representations.

Religion is humble, free, honest, frank, loving, seeking the liberty of others rather than its own, and thus the more certainly assuring it without selfish efforts or selfish prayers. When therefore a representative of religion encroaches upon the natural liberty of another man, whether of mind or body, we know by that act that he has no religion, and represents no religious act. He merely resurrests the savage and criminal.

A pope, who in his pride, no matter what the pretext, places his foot on the neck of another man, whether emperor or beggar, loses his Christian character. An emperor, who ceremonially washes the feet of the poor, only mocks savagely a higher sentiment. Kings and ministers, who tread upon the rights of others, murdering in the form of war, tyrannizing under pretence of governing, persecuting under party or sectarian animosity, are only representatives of the old criminal class.

Read the edicts of eastern monarchs, Brothers of the sun and moon, king of kings, lords of the twenty-four umbrellas, &c. &c. ; then read the edicts of western monarchs, popes, and other unrestrained people ; there is but a short step from the savage bombast of the one to the semi-civilized conceit of the other.

In the Bible printed in Edinburgh, 1715, we have a dedication "to the most High and mighty Prince, James, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith," &c., and beginning, "Great and manifold were the Blessings, (most dread Sovereign) which Almighty God, the Father of all mercies, bestowed upon us the people of England, when first he sent your majesty's Royal Person to rule and reign over us," &c. The worthies then speak of Elizabeth, as "the bright occidental star," and, "the appearance of your majesty, as of the Sun in his strength," &c.

This conceit in politics is the source of oppression ; in religion, of persecution, slander and falsehood, or want of consideration for others ; in business, of robbery, sharp practice, and deception.

In the world of work, it is not the man who creates wealth by the labor of his hands or brain, but he who, in the lottery of life and its ill-regulated usages, finds the *opportunity* to take hold of the accumulations of labor, who represents pride. In the official and clerical world, it is not the clerk or priest who does the practical work that the nation or church, firm or company require, but the superintending official, who having it in his power to escape real labor, is the representative of pride in the concern.

Everywhere in the actions of men, it is less the individual, than the position to which he attains or into which he is thrust, that calls forth the conceit which is the foundation of irregularity and imbecility. It is in fact the demoralization of inequality.

There is in life but one counterbalancing power capable of nullifying the persistent action of this absorbing and universally active faculty, and that is conscientiousness, or a sentiment of justice. This is the great *lever* of civilization ; the *mental pivot* about which all selfish agencies work with little danger. It is a power, as yet, by reason of the necessities of mere existence, so inactive and weak, that it scarcely exerts any active influence over one mind in a hundred. Benevolence or charity, brought into activity by the general progress of knowledge and improved training, is gradually drawing it out into practical life by the demands it is unceasingly making upon it.

Look to the effects of pride in brutalizing the mind. With what indifference, men and women, but a few short centuries ago, enjoyed the spectacle of the decapitation or torture of some, so called, "State criminal !" Kings, queens, and their attendants would "take pleasure" in the scene, satisfied that a traitor to *their* interests deserved such a death. Yet it is alleged, these men and women were *tenderly* brought up ! Take the priest full of piety and charity — with what

zeal he has gloated over the agonies of the victims of rack, and wheel, and fire ! the word "heretic" or "infidel" had turned him crazy ! The honest and ever praying Moslem is a fanatic of the worst kind when the "dog of a Christian" is before him. It would seem as if the careful instillation of self-conceit in religion, which has characterized the corrupted Christian sects, in particular, and its predecessors, has done more to torment and degrade humanity, than most of the so-called pagan creeds.

With such systems of pride in politics and religion, we could not have freedom. Then what constitutes freedom ? not a name. But that system of simplified laws and fair usages between human beings, that gives to each perfect liberty of action consistent with the rights of others. A nation of freemen may be governed by a despot, and yet be free. But a nation of despots—that is, a nation whose laws are the plaything of every rogue—may have the most liberal of governments in name, and yet not know, in the general oppression of one by another, even a shadow of real liberty. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

I. IN THE RELIGIOUS SYSTEM.

In the struggles of spirit to control matter, two points present themselves prominently as shaping our course, and causing us to deviate almost insensibly from the main object of our conquest—namely, necessity and opportunity. A spiritual force prompts to improvement, to change, to the amelioration of our condition ; while the fresh ardor, generosity, and self-sacrifice of youth energize our efforts, suggest the modes of action, and indicate the probable road to success. This activity is a necessity of our mental organization. But when we have conquered difficulties, triumphed over opposition in the scramble for mere existence ; have acquired reputation, fame, power ; even dictate our will, our interpretations of law to many, perhaps to millions ; then, with opportunity, our feelings and opinions change.

Thus are we led into temptation ; the sober mind is crazed. I would not say that all leaders and teachers have through success and opportunity, forgotten their first inspirations, and deviated into selfishness, which is the imbecility of intellect. But in the very few cases wherein the wise man has clung to his wisdom, martyrdom has crowned the effort of early aspirations before age and opportunity clouded the purity of his intentions.

Wherever, in such cases, the teaching has deviated from the teacher, these errors can be traced to the less purely inspired minds of disci-

ples, who were merely temporarily magnetized by the spiritual power of their masters, and whom success and the opportunity of control have corrupted. In part, also, to the impossibility of rooting out ancient habits and superstitions, which by time and ancestral influence have become so engrafted into the mind, that a long training in an opposite mode of thought could alone obliterate them. Now those systems of "religion" have best succeeded, which most cunningly incorporated these evils by a mere change of names. But by so doing, they have perpetuated the evils they might have cured. What is called Christianity, is so full of the Saturnalia of its predecessors, that, stripped of the name, the difference in doctrine, forms, dressings and ceremonies is hardly discoverable. The Protestant, or protesting spirit, is as ancient as the corruption itself. In other words, the commercial and political habits of the controlling classes, hostile to the principles of equality and fraternity, overthrew the true doctrine that makes all men free, and re-inaugurated the system of superstition and authority.

Moses was learned in all the learning of the Egyptians, and we have a proof of this influence in his organization of the Jewish priesthood and doctrine. He was acquainted no doubt with those mechanical, magical or chemical arts, whereby the ancient priests imposed their will "in the name of the Lord" upon the ignorant; exciting or quenching the fire upon the altar; making statues and pictures weep, &c., &c.

A murderer, driven into the wilderness, necessity taught him wisdom, made him conceive plans of religious organization, which in the strife and glitter of Egyptian social life would never have been suggested to his mind. He sought in vengeance his opportunity and found it; the outlaw became a leader, and the oppressed, whether few or many, under his experienced guidance, passed the desert.

How far these Homeric traditions are true in fact, is not here the question. The oriental story-teller in those lands where education is scarcely known, much less writing and printing, still finds listeners and admirers, whether he relates the story of the creation of a world, the adventures of a princess, the sufferings of Job, or the wonderful deeds of Hercules, or Joshua. He embellishes to attract; he exaggerates to glorify his hero or his God; and he who undertakes to record his wonders, must make just allowance for his artistic and zealous improvements upon the originals.

We have in this story of a Jewish tribe a little history of man in his various struggles to overcome by spiritual power the material influ-

ences which in the earlier stages of semi-civilized life have so completely controlled him. As man progresses in a knowledge of the spiritual laws, he learns to reach a higher plane. But in that grand march of mind how slow the steps of civilization ! how many imperfect efforts ! how many failures ! what acts of violence to accomplish the very progress which denounces those acts ! The more we investigate the Chinese, Hindoo and Egyptian records, whether cut in the rocks, or written, the farther we are compelled to carry back the story of civilization. A thousand years is indeed but a day in such a work. The childish fables of the Jew or Arab, modern, compared with those of other nations of the farthest East, had in the Western movement of civilization, been carried to the shores of the Mediterranean by the pioneer Abrahams of the time.

The most striking part of the Moses story is : that his people had originally no organized priesthood, but respected the inspirations of intuitive thinkers or seers. He established an aristocracy of spiritual guides ; organized forms of worship, including ark, cherubim and other paraphernalia already in use for thousand of years, wherever lazy authority had imposed itself to live upon the labor of others.

The pioneers of nations bring free thoughts and ways with them ; but time binds the old bonds again about them, and the freedom left, is too little to save them from national and moral degradation. Once organized in the interests of a class, the Jewish progress, like that of the nations which had preceded them among Eastern, and which followed them among Western nations, never went beyond the temporary prosperity of that class. The legalized beggary of the great mass of the people, and their mental subjection through priestly control, absorbed the sources of wealth, created political parties among the idlers, and led to revolutions and invasions.

Their kings or chiefs — for the term king is scarcely fitting for the chief of so very small a territory as Judea — were clearly imposed by the influence of the priests, who are instinctly opposed to human freedom. Being dependent for support on the bounty of others, priests naturally love that power and authority which can render their support more liberal and permanent. Blinded by the necessity of their position, imposed upon them by their training, they do not see the irreligious side of their material dependence, but prompted by the opportunity of power and influence, advocate all royal claims to authority. The emphatic warning of Samuel could not change their instinctive determination.

Still the old love of the people for inspired teachers is shown in the

pertinacity with which they put faith in them. They were accused of "stoning the prophets," just as in modern times the people are accused of the crimes and revolutions of political parties — which are really organized and controlled by the idle and poor of the upper classes, the Mirabeaus of society — while in fact, the prophets were stoned at the instigation of the priesthood by the "faithful," or rowdy element, of their church system. This method of opposition is still in vogue in every part of the world.

In all these movements, Moses seems to have asserted his own importance with considerable energy, while he strove to maintain it by means of a class in which he had been brought up among the Egyptians. But in the case of Mahomet, who lived to see and feel his own authority, the case is still more evident.

We all know into what a state of corruption the Christian church had fallen after it had by persecution, quitted the fraternal or social system, and re-entered the class or self-asserting system of authority and priesthood. Many reformers appeared who could not reconcile the original teachings with the paganized forms. They all perished or "repented and were converted." Mahomet alone was successful. Having escaped the knife, indignation and necessity drove him to resistance, to aggression as a means of revenge, and then to conquest. With conquest commenced his opportunity.

He who had undertaken in the simple conscientiousness and enthusiasm of his youthful spirit, from love of God and justice, to reform the Christian church, now under the new aspects of prosperity, the dazzling influences of power, the excitements of self-conceit, and the flatterings of friends, was not long in asserting self in everything. The willing, humble, zealous instrument now proclaimed himself the master, and, while still advocating in opposition to the traders in religion, and their profitable worship of saints and images, the supremacy of one God, the Father of all as taught by Jesus, he allowed himself to be proclaimed the first of men: "There is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet."

No prophet can be considered perfect who does not entirely forget self. We may say that no one is a true prophet who ever asserts himself in any way above his fellow men. If Jesus is true, it is because he taught the brotherhood of all. An assertion of superiority is at once an assertion of pride and vanity, which are active faculties of mere animal or criminal life. It is the subjection of these to the universal ends or law of life, the good of all that characterizes Christian teaching. Those who want to make Jesus assert himself above

others, are always themselves self-assertors, who thus, under the shadow of this assumption, fight for their own personal aggrandizement and power to persecute and oppress others.

"I am better than thou," is the universal sect-doctrine, the spirit of rivalry and animosity that fires the fanaticism of the thoughtless, the grand stimulant of social troubles, wars and crimes. When in the plastic mind of the child, an animal in all its instincts, this spirit of self-conceit is excited until it absorbs all others and closes the intellect to a fair appreciation of the other and better ways of God, how can the words of Christian love, and justice and fraternity be anything but a mockery of imitation forced upon it occasionally among its relatives and friends, whom it has a self-interest in trying to love?

Nearly all the religious life of a few good souls is devoted to rooting out the errors thus built into the mind. The bad brick of savage pride and hatred is hardened in with the mortar of prayer and pious usages. To replace it is the slow work of the ages, aided by God's angels.

What man's religion is—if we may call these errors of belief, religion—so is his social and political mode of action. The grandly true religious doctrine of fraternity, in active conflict with superstition nearly 3000 years ago, has progressed in spite of caste and priesthood, until it has become now-a-days a dogma of clerical teaching, manipulated with much care and fear in the hands of the self-assertors.

Of more modern reformers, when the *necessity* of their movements culminated in power, did the *opportunity* always escape them to retaliate upon their opponents? Did they leave untroubled more enlightened and progressive spirits? Need we refer to Calvin, to Luther even, the Puritan fathers and many others? If Gregory "the Great," in the night of the Dark Ages, calculating on the ignorance and superstition of the Tartar aristocracy, then lording it over Europe, seized the opportunity to impose clerical power over the western world, did he do more than Mahomet in changing from religious zeal and artificial humility to crazy ambition?

In the savage and semi-civilized condition, man is said to be a "fighting animal." He fights to rob—religiously, socially, politically. And in these contests of opportunity the prophet as well as the priest have too often shown a criminal zeal. An eminent writer in his history of the Jewish monarchy, remarks with much truth: "it is undeniable that in the Israelitish Prophets as in the Scotch Reformers, the pugnacious principle was too much in the ascendant."

And just so long as the "prophets prophesy falsely in my name and the people love to have it so," will the principle of Religion be misunderstood and the idolatry of forms and beliefs prevail.

Another example of self-assertion, modern and feeble in these more enlightened times, is that given in the late letter of the amiable old man, Pope Pius of Rome, in which he protests against the "odious laws" passed by the Parliament of Austria. This is its "odious" nature as described by him : "That law (Dec. 21, 1867,) establishes free liberty for all opinions, liberty for the press, and all faiths, and no matter what "confession or doctrine." What careful training in erroneous habits and thoughts, cemented by prayer, and stimulated by adulation and fulsome flattery as to his own personal importance, must have been necessary to pervert a naturally good mind. Here we have one of the last protests of pride against true religion, which is fraternity, good will, freedom. Here we have the system which is always praying selfishly for itself and its own power to control—which thus arrives necessarily at self-assertion and love of despotism, or the control of others for the *supposed* good of a few—utterly at variance with religion : that is, praying for and helping others unselfishly, or the being good and doing good. A system of praying to impose its will and whimsies, live idly upon and oppress others, rather than leave to others that liberty which God gives to all. Thus is religion persecuted in the name and under cover of religion ; liberty, under the pretence of liberty ; right, through acts and forms of law and justice.

Another form of self-assertion by an advocate of clerical power is : "Heresy and infidelity have not, and never had, and never can have, any right, being, as they undeniably are, contrary to the law of God." Then the Catholic system, being "heresy and infidelity" to the preceding systems, as always denounced by them, must be "contrary to the law of God."

A Bishop of St. Louis frankly says : "Catholicity will one day rule America, and religious freedom will be at an end." Here the demon of exclusiveness and tyranny, trained and nurtured in the old books, creations of the unmanly man of savage times, dreams of power over millions, and luxurious idleness out of their hard earned industry.

Just as in a field of wheat we observe that the finest and truest ears are those bent down meekly to the earth, so where there is true religion the mind is humble, simple, and ever open to knowledge and conviction. With the self-assertors, the height of wisdom has been

attained, and every new and beneficent discovery denounced by them as "odious," and the inventor pointed out *for hatred!* God is truth. Religion is the manifestation of truth. If a man has attained the standard of man, his first duty when he comprehends the diversity of opinions, beliefs, and interests created over the world by the Father of all, is studiously to investigate the system in which he happens to have been brought up, and ascertain the history of his sacred records, traditions, and superstitions. If he assumes self-conceitedly that "*our*" system must be true, starting from such a sandy foundation, his researches will only end in deception. For strong as the reasoning power of man may be, pride and pocket-interest have a stultified invincibility about them which ever turn aside the benignant rays of truth.

2. IN THE SOCIAL SYSTEM.

The necessities of life and the opportunities again mislead us. If we would train a child in the way it should go, look to its earliest impressions. The agitations of life affect father and mother unfavorably—hence the offspring. Then the education is the result of the bigotry and selfishness of a sect. The child is not allowed an independent, that is, a religious thought. It must follow the old books. It must not ask an unauthorized question. If it wants to know the why and wherefore of human doctrines, constantly conflicting with God-laws, the scowl and blow are sure to follow. Its love for truth and knowledge, it is told, comes from a creature, called Satan. Such children, however good they might have been, become, through this cramming of contradictory stories and imperfect scientific or artistic knowledge, constitutional liars.

In the moral and intellectual training, words and books are made to supersede facts and laws. The sciences are the play-ground of youth; words meaningless to children, are the Sahara of the intellect. The tenderest child understands an object only by seeing and feeling it. Scholars have often little originality, and are frequently most dangerous social and political advisers. If the true principles of political economy were taught children, could they in after life live by robbing others, when they understood the penalty? Could they pursue unproductive professions without shame? Could they take from a fellow man his just earnings, under pretext of giving employment? Could they dismiss a man and ruin his family, making him a dependent or beggar for the time being, because he differed in opinion?

All that in the social system is erroneous is maintained chiefly by the "learned" in the quaint old "sacred" books of every profession.

Can it be possible, said an eminent "Divine," that my father has spent thousands of dollars upon my education only for me to find now both time and study wasted? Can the years I have spent in perfecting my medical studies in Edinburgh and Paris, said a skillful physician of the old school practice, be almost valueless in these days of homœopathy and "laying on of hands?" There are many such complaints in life. Every day inventions supersede the rude labor of hand; but the many gain by increase of work and greater skill. Shall the "gentlemanly" professions make no progress? Watts's first engines were bungling affairs; the cylinders were not bored, but hammered, and "leaked in every direction." "The velocity, violence, and horrible noise of the engine, gave universal satisfaction." "What a contrast this," says a modern writer, "to the smooth, irresistible, noiseless action of a steam-engine of the present day, constructed with mathematical accuracy and perfect finish!"

Shall the work of politics, religion, law, and medicine stand still, while the machinist and the laboring man are conquering the world by mechanical, material, and consequently moral improvements? It is useless for the learned to occupy themselves with ingenious sophistries to reconcile the truth of progress with the errors of the past. Such compromises of conscience will not pass with the world for infallible truths.

The importance of the higher professions cannot be denied. To administer Justice; to cure the sick; to point out religious truths; to keep the peace, and direct the policy of a nation, are each and all most important objects.

There is in the world of nature a wonderful order and obedience to law. Each life manifestation seems in itself to be perfect, and to fulfil with earnestness and energy the law of its being. There is no inequality; no enslavement of others; no false uses; but a general freedom of action, which leave each creature at liberty to follow out the object of its creation.

It is not so with man. In passing from the animal to the intellectual condition, a portion seem to have commenced by violating the rights of others, and with the progress of the encroachment, they evidently increased in the wickedness of their arts, until all humanity became subjected to the artificial social arrangements which grew out of this fighting disorder. Yet the wronged demanded right, the sick called for cure, the discouraged for hope. Thus the conqueror, as

the representative of force, became also the dispenser of justice ; the physician, and often the priest.

But the one-man-power could not be everywhere ; and hence his rights were delegated to such as would make a "loyal" use of them. Just, however, as men are emancipating themselves from the slavery of labor, so also must they do so from the power of these petted and chartered professions, which restrain the progress of truth in their particular branches, and pervert them to oppression and fortune-making uses.

These professions have been called "gentlemanly," because, not only were special studies demanded, and special privileges granted to make them attractive to the youths of the upper class, but that they might become ornaments to the courts and ramparts about the usurpations of the conquerors who patronized them. The lawyer was needed to defend the newly acquired conquests ; the medical man to cure, and by his supposed magic powers, to ward off ills and evils ; the priest to consecrate the power imposed, and anoint the uneasy hero ; the politician to give official dignity and importance to his capricious whims and will (insanity of power) ; while the soldier, a gentleman at ease, who used to exercise his predatory habits on friends and foes alike, still maintains with blind obedience the order of this disorder.

All these habits have modified by the progress of civilization. But still it must be remarked that the working of these petted professions is disadvantageous to the interests of humanity, inasmuch as justice, charity (cure), and veneration have been perverted into mere channels of class selfishness. The scientific have been alternately persecuted and praised, because their practical truths were dreaded as fatal to imposture and assumption. But cowed by their false position, the seekers of truth have too often professed not to believe their own discoveries, until they found that the vulgar had learned to believe them !

If the professions do not now blindly obey a tyrant, they obey but too blindly the many tyrants of wealth. The priests, wrapped up in the pleasures of social visits and entertainments, find it hard to frequent the poor. How can they ? Should there be such poor ? There is a pleasure however in giving, particularly of other peoples' money ; and there is a secret pleasure in the contrast with their wretchedness ! How grateful these poor things are ! How charming is charity ! But why not be still more charitable, as the early Christians tried to be, by being *JUST* to them ? The medical man is occa-

sionally useful in shutting up, as insane, troublesome wives and heirs—a business once absorbed by convents and monasteries. While the lawyer looking to the “very great importance” (rascality of some rich man) of a case proves or disproves it according to the interest he receives in it. The soldier sells himself for his living to sustain without reflection the unreason of power.

But in this action of bodies of men so disadvantageous to society, the individuals are comparatively innocent and unwilling instruments. There is many a pang of sorrow and oath of indignation at the inevitable necessity of doing one's “duty.” There is many a mocking thought at the trickery, imposture, and charlatanism which the victim of place is forced to carry out.

However necessary each profession may be in its true position, as at present exercised, it cannot be otherwise than injurious to the general interest. Few of these busy persons add to the wealth of a nation ; they are consumers, not producers ; they waste by expensive habits what would suffice to support several of the producing class, and therefore there must be a large counterpart of pauperism. Liberalize the professions, simplify, popularize them ; take from them exclusiveness, and their learning will be less blundering, more solid, and infinitely more useful. And as men become more learned, as scientific knowledge has become more general, we observe that professional men have become less conceited and positive in their assertions and assumptions of practice. The old books begin to be appreciated at their real value.

We might illustrate the irresponsible character of these professions by anecdotes which, if extreme, show at least the power men in authority have to do wrong with perfect impunity, and the defectiveness of the law system, concentrated by usurpers in a few hands to suit their own purposes. There are two remedies to this evil ; liberalizing the practice and dispensation of justice, and making judges and magistrates responsible for their acts.

Some six or seven centuries ago, Roman law became so popular, that popes and councils forbid the clergy to study it. “To men of that time,” says a writer, “lost in the chaos of feudal laws, the Roman Code, an admirable collection of logical deductions derived from natural equity and common utility, seemed truly, as they called it, ‘written reason.’” The Judge-made law-system of England is a combination of the two. Many Roman principles, but a deceptive feudal practice.

It has become a common saying in our own free land, that a rich

man cannot be convicted of a crime, yet that in Europe the highest nobles have little chance of escape. Here, however, is some exaggeration. An English judge, in commenting on a case before him some years ago, said : "Lawyers must feel ashamed of the number of conflicting decisions." Human experience everywhere dreads and mocks at the system. He that is right fears more that the wrong doer. The majority of lawsuits are persecutions of honest people by rogues, who know that all the chances are in favor of wrong. And the tricks and frauds are rather defended and praised than denounced by those on the bench, who, having been trained in the same false ideas of right and wrong, act from ignorance.

By substituting a page of an almanac of one year for that of another year, a lawyer confused a witness and gained his cause ! No one saw the injustice to the cause, but every one applauded the fraud ! A gentleman was accused, convicted, and hung, for the supposed murder of his neice, upon evidence that some one heard her say : "O uncle, you will kill me !" She had run away to be married, and for a year never heard of the trial. The lawyers *by taking sides*, by hunting up ill-natured testimony, by exaggerations, and *pointing him out to the indignation of the jury as a hypocrite, aiming to obtain possession of her fortune*, brought about the death of a man of spotless character ! The lawyer's object is not to *ascertain the fact*, but, as *he takes sides, to gain his case*.

There was another noted case in England. A very amiable, learned, and conscientious man, came into considerable possessions. The lawyers opposing him, anxious to make money out of the case, induced parties (not heirs), to attack his rights. They had no legal case ; but the judges, knowing their purposes apparently, winked at the illegality. In about a year they proposed terms, but were firmly refused, as their course was regarded as an attempt at swindling. Years passed away, and again and again they urged a settlement ; and finally after an altercation, threatened to destroy their victim. They succeeded, and by the only means in their power — they mutilated one of the principal documents ; but the timidity of a clerk led to a discovery, and the suicide of the chemist employed. They then, a little later, substituted a forgery for another document, and backed up their charges by old letters which they had procured or stolen, and in several of which they had altered the sense of passages so as to appear to support their charges. These they read to the jury without proper verification.

In none of these cases of "legal practice" will any punishment be

found to have followed the frauds, even when discovered. The lawyers, in the latter case, had so well *covered their tracks*, that though they did not prove their charge, they escaped unhurt, and yet afforded the judges *excuse enough* to decide in favor of illegality. The impolicy of refusing to share with these persons, *who are now authorized irresponsibly to dispense law*, is evident !

In medical practice, the fortune-making power sometimes modifies the action of the profession. Many years ago, a young practitioner was remonstrated with for curing his patients too rapidly ; he was very indignant. His income now is immense. It is a common custom for men of wealth to allow the family physician a fixed sum per annum. A rich Englishman, not having adopted that plan, paid for attendance and drugs about \$1,500 a year. Under better advice he agreed to pay \$500 as a fixed rate. Sickness disappeared.

These are all cases of necessity and opportunity, the growth of a system conceived in selfishness, and carried out in ignorance of the rights of humanity. The military, as well as the clerical professions, have their anecdotes too, but so well known as scarcely to need example. If these pet professions of the "governing" classes have such natural deformities, we cannot be surprised if the arbitrary power, called government, under its various imperfect forms, is not much in advance of them. Has a man a claim upon his government, it is almost impossible to obtain the amount, unless by a division of spoils.

The most lamentable part of the effects of training in wrong ideas, is the demoralization of even the best disposed men. Take a sectarian fanatic, built up on the platform of self-conceit ! what violence, what denunciation ! what readiness to persecute ! A distinguished English barrister was blamed for disgracing his profession by accepting silver instead of gold from a client ! He apologized, adding : "but I took every sixpence the fellow had, and I hope you don't call that disgracing the profession ? "

C. Piazzi Smith, says, "Whatever a rich man wants done, he can always get clever lawyers, even the first of the day, to help him to do." The "Irish Republic," commenting on impeachment, remarks : "It is almost impossible for a lawyer to be a statesman. A lawyer would stand on the 99th part of a hair for a technicality, and thereon murder a principle which concerned humanity, to satisfy some old fogy precedent of the feudal ages, or some narrow individual or local interest."

But the worst of these habits is their effect upon the victims. "We

sometimes speak of the days of the Inquisition, and solace ourselves with the thought that they have gone forever: but nothing but the form of the thing has changed; instead of the thumb-screw and the rack, we employ social scandal, we run down a man's business so that he cannot get a living, we drive him out of the church and out of the town, and it is not our fault if he is not crowded out of the world."

This boasted law is so fond of doing wrong, that if a man is cheated by false misrepresentations into contracts clearly fraudulent as time will develop, the law gives no relief, but *makes the honest man the slave and supporter of the knave*. It sides with the rogue, and impudently says; "it is your fault if you are not as great a rogue as the cheat, and if you have not more foresight than a seer. Since you will be honest and manly you must pay the penalty." The *excuses*, alleged for *reasons*, are mere insults added to injury. But if a poor man attempts such a trick upon a rich man, how soon the lawyer finds a remedy.

Just as in law and religion, so the old medical books contained an abundance of mystification, bad diagnosis, and stupid experiment. The savage man is displayed in the violence of the treatment; and we need not go far back to find prescriptions fit for the "medicine man" of our red-skins. But just as chemistry is ridding itself of alchemy, so medicine, religion, and law, are ridding themselves of the charlatanisms of the past.

It will always be remarked that the professions are linked together by a common bond of union, of thought and interest. Hence there is a general opposition to innovation, or to that which threatens the temporary interest; and a general reliance upon fictions and false practices, because they are old. They prefer the uncertainties; things that decide nothing, cure no one, right no one, and benefit no one substantially out of the class. Hence while preaching peace, the preachers are inculcating prejudice, and are most active abettors of war; while lauding the healing art, man follows an unhealing practice; while quoting great maxims of law and justice, men sanction the legal confirmation of almost every wrong; and while talking of patriotism and glory, they are committing robbery and assassination!

When we see how humanity has been kept in subjection and ignorance by the influence of these great professions, and how their trading capacities or fortune-making powers rival in selfishness the great commercial interests of the world, we almost wonder that men should attribute to any church system those passages in Revelation which would seem to be so much more applicable to agencies whose exclu-

siveness, pride and combination are so universally disadvantageous to humanity. The effort of the early Christians to establish a better system of equality and fairness would show that their great teacher or teachers had comprehended the difficulty. For the "woman arrayed in purple and fine linen," &c., and "upon her forehead was a name written MYSTERY," &c., is far more applicable to the *mystifications* of professional practice of *every* kind than to any *one* in particular.

The land, air, and water, are gifts of God to man, not made *by* man, but *for* him, and the usurpation at an early date of the first is one of the chief sources of pauperism. There is ample opportunity for creating wealth without usurping an exclusive possession of the soil. Its productive capacity is infinitely less than it should be if free to man. The waste, resulting from the failures of individual effort to cultivate it, is enormous. Combination and machinery will yet do wonders ; but, if land is the chief, it is far from being the only, source of wealth. The industry of man has created such a wonderful variety of productive labor, that nothing is needed but freedom from exclusiveness, monopoly, and oppression, together with fair pay to every one for labor performed, to create a power of exchange that seems illimitable.

All that approaches truth distinguishes itself by simplicity. The falsest systems all wear a disguise. It would seem as if an instinct of wrong prompted men to show their falsity. Instinctively the rogue wears a mask of honesty ; this is his homage to virtue : but he wants to impose ; and immediately he puts on the startling robe of the charlatan, covered with hieroglyphics, all of which have a "sacred" meaning. The king wears a crown, and is arrayed in gorgeous garments. The soldier sports a gay uniform, and stars and crosses, in addition to arms. The priest in "purple and fine linen," mitre, &c., proudly shows his colors ; while the religious orders stalk along happy in the consciousness of wearing a dress which attracts attention by peculiarity of outline or color so gratifying to the vanity of artificial humility. The lawyer is proud of wig and gown, &c. But it may also be remarked that exactly in proportion as a profession becomes less exclusive and false, the outward appearance of its professors changes, so that, as in the case of medical and scientific men, it becomes impossible to distinguish them from their brethren of other classes. This compliment may also be paid to most religious teachers for the truth's sake, and to those lawyers where the law has been modified to suit the progressive idea of the time.

The more there is of actual unproductive labor in a class, the more it clamors for splendid living and magnificent entertainment and show. Hence the gorgeous palaces, chateaux, temples, cathedrals, churches, law courts, and halls; the pompous forms, and ceremonies, and rich dressings, to amuse the vain and proud, and impose upon the people. And with the advent of the Tartars (Saxons, Goths, Huns, Vandals, &c.,) the clerical profession in particular—where with their barbarous aid it crept into power—imitated the ranks and titles, dear to those savages, and obliterated in a chaos of political strifes, crusades and prosecutions what simplicity there had been in Christianity and Roman Republicanism.

Now while the individuals, as already remarked, may have the best intentions, and during the whole course of their lives may strive by good works to compensate for the evils which duty to their profession and the necessity of the family, may compel, nevertheless the man of experience will have seen how these trainings in exclusiveness and selfishness must demoralize the great majority of morally weak men. The knowledge of God's works, science, moralizes. The training in "worldly" modes of life, through classical and literary studies, backed by the knowledge of the machiavelian devices to fortune and power, demoralizes. In the first case, man by knowledge learns how to subdue the earth, and create wealth out of its innumerable and exhaustless resources. By the second, he *only learns how best to make a living out of his fellow man*. The passion to be a conqueror or robber on a great scale finds here its gratification in a thousand forms, from the highest—military, to the lowest—pickpocket. And what talent wasted! what energy misdirected!

Our schools by this exclusive book-training, give to our youth a disgust for the ruder and more honest conquest of the Earth, and drive them to the city, where they find gratification in the excitement of doing wrong, by preying upon others. The *smarter* the boy, the more surely is he destined by this road to jail, or wealth and power. The majority necessarily fail, and more particularly that portion of our youth who are considered unusually smart. Having learned at home and at school to impose on their companions, they enter life believing only in deception. They do not know, and generally never learn, that in the less indulgent life of the world, a man loses character and caste in proportion to his impostures, and that the remarkable number of failures of business men is attributable to their ignorance of the value of principle in dealing with the public. Also that the special cases of success among smart men result rather

from the accidental opportunities, which a few attain, to override character. The law, the church, and politics do sometimes cover up a multitude of sins.

Mrs. Somerville, in her admirable work on Physical Geography, says: "No permanently retrograde movement can now take place in civilization; the diffusion of Christian virtues and of knowledge ensures the progressive advancement of man in those high, moral, and intellectual qualities that constitute his true dignity. But much yet remains to be done at home, especially in religious instruction, and the prevention of crime; and millions of our fellow-creatures in both hemispheres are still in the lowest grade of barbarism." "Let those who doubt of his indefinite improvement compare the first revolution in France with the last, or the state of Europe in the middle ages with what it is at present." "In our own country, men who seem to have lived before their time, were formerly prosecuted and punished for opinions which are now sanctioned by the legislature, and acknowledged by all."

The most important class in a nation, that on which wealth, prosperity and power depend, is just the one most ignorantly despised and ill-treated by its barbarous lords. All progress benefits the upper classes; because everything that tends to improve the condition of the workman, enriches the landholder by rent, and the increased value of land; and by the augmented demand for the necessities of life adds to the number and business of small traders, manufacturers, and merchants.

Take a single case, and see how it will work. You employ a workman, and for labor done, pay him a dollar; this enables him to buy some article of necessity, say bread. With this same dollar the baker can also buy some article of necessity; and so the dollar circulates for weeks, or months, or years — returning occasionally to the hand which put it in movement — until it has been the means of producing a multitude of business-exchanges. But if the dollar had not been paid, because you, an ignorant, would-be aristocrat, think the workman "has no rights you need respect," then all that series of exchanges, going on as long as that dollar is in circulation, will not have had existence, and the nation and *you* will be so much the poorer by your ignorance and meanness.

Now, when we look back into the condition of society during the dark ages of Europe, we find why population oftentimes actually diminished, why all classes were constantly fighting with, and preying upon each other, clan against clan, family against family. Hunger and

excessive poverty of nobles and people exasperated both, while "religious" orders joined in the mêlée, and profited by the social confusion.

As slaves, the people received no compensation for work done. They built gigantic castles, monasteries, cathedrals, and churches, which yielded no return in rent or shelter to them. No money circulated among them: hence there were no small traders, merchants, &c., as there was scarcely any business. The Baron's retainers lived by plundering raids.

As serfdom succeeded to slavery, and emancipated the workman from entire subjection to his master, enabling him to work a few days occasionally for pay, business increased with the demand for the necessities of life, the trading classes came more prominently into existence, and the great landholders, heretofore comparatively poor, found themselves growing richer every day.

As emancipation still further progressed, and the workman in some countries had a full right to compensation for all work performed by him, the circulation of money thus created, produced such immense demands on the markets for all the necessities and many of the luxuries of life, that the wealth and strength of those nations grew in proportion to the liberty thus enjoyed. And thus, wherever the rights of the workman are most respected, the rich are most numerous and prosperous.

It is clearly then not the amount which mere labor produces that enriches a nation, but the vast amount of business created by the circulation of money through wages, that enriches, by stimulating into existence a thousand industries which are utterly unknown in a slave country. Again, slave labor, as mere labor, in its own limited sphere, is never so productive or perfect as free labor.

The effort, then, of the early Christians to develope the resources of labor by a kind of co-operative system, was a piece of sound religious sense and social policy. By such means alone could the true principles of religion be established and maintained, and the rights and prosperity of all classes assured. Pauperism, that curse of false religious ideas, would thus have been annihilated.

3. IN THE POLITICAL SYSTEM.

M. Renan says: "Governments and nations should be based upon science, philosophy, and law, and not upon bayonets and physical force. In the petty game of ambition, consequences and principles are equally overlooked, until honest merit makes a boast of abandoning the government to the intriguers and schemers."

As in religion, so in politics, charlatanism is too often triumphant. But in religion the charlatan is adored as a saint, while in politics he is admired as a statesman. A man is early instructed to appear to be what he is not ; to conform to any prevalent opinion or interest ; to accept any predominant creed or party platform ; to use any means to serve his purpose : to know how to buy and sell, bargain or intrigue, to arrive at place and power ; to use women in her most disadvantageous aspects ; to fawn, flatter, falsify, and even forge — for a falsehood is a forgery by word of mouth ; — to have a newspaper at his disposal, whose ingenious misstatements of facts will make him out a paragon of virtue and talents, even if he be the very embodiment of shallowness and hypocrisy.

The honest man of the world can hardly reach the summits of power for want of the necessary elasticity of conscience. Hence men of great ability and wealth frequently find it impossible to obtain a footing among the "elect." There are illustrious names in every empire and kingdom — illustrious in notoriety at least — whose capacity and honesty would not bear a very severe test. This may seem harsh, yet how account for the low moral reputation of governments ? Men dread to come in contact with them. Have you a just claim ? You will find yourself baffled, misled, defrauded by almost every official, unless you smooth the way with golden promises. Dickens has thrown some little light on the "circumlocution" system in matters of ordinary business, as he has also exposed the follies of law practice and lawyers.

Appeal to a parliamentary body for justice, they will probably deride your right and dismiss you with contempt, if you do not know how to interest them ! Take a council of the most eminent ecclesiastics, men, who in conversation are full of the unction of piety and charity — so well has stage-effect been produced by training and habit — and this reverend body, influenced by the most selfish prejudices, will be guilty of acts of injustice, cruelty, and folly.

In political life, men seem too selfish to be willing to do right, and have too much self-conceit to care what men may think of their acts. Doing wrong as a body, or, as it were, in the form of law, covers up the individual responsibility, and brings into life the savage instinct, still lurking in the man. The acts of legislation, as well as of executive and judicial power, frequently partake of this insanity of authoritative action. In our own beloved country, public opinion has a certain influence, and would exert a much healthier moral power, if the press was less the organ of parties and sects, and was not used to

propagate calumnies, and excite prejudices. While we are strict in examining the claims of men to teach in schools, preach in churches, and build our railroads, we recklessly permit any man, no matter how violent in temper and character, to mislead, as editors, the public in regard to acts on which the national life, prosperity, and morals depend !

We greatly err when we presume that one country is freer than another because the government appears to have a more liberal basis. A constitutional government may exercise more despotic power than a despotism, when the fundamental laws do not protect the people from the tyranny of classes and sects. England, a constitutional government, is a despotism in disguise ; millions of her people are beggared, controlled and oppressed by feudal laws. Belgium is also a constitutional government, but her people are partly free by reason of the protection afforded by the Code Napoleon. This admirable embodiment of the wisdom of the great legislators of the ancient republics is a monument to the good sense of Napoleon I., who personally revised every article, from an unwillingness to leave them to be manipulated exclusively by men who make a business of litigation.

In short, no people are free where the slave power of appointment and arbitrary dismissal is allowed by law or usage to be exercised by one man over another. The folly and injustice of such a power has been felt so strongly by the aristocratic officials of Europe, that it is scarcely ever, if ever, exercised except in cases of decided criminality. This despotism, handed down from barbarous times, and exercised throughout every class, is a violation of a man's natural right to the fruits of his labor. It is his or her special property, and should no more be made the plaything of despotism than any other property. If people cannot agree, an exchange may always be effected. But when a man's opinions can be controlled by the sudden ruin of his family ; when his place is made to depend upon his falseness and hypocrisy, can society be anything than what we all acknowledge it to be ? To talk of Christianity, of morals, of religion, with such a practical violation of their fraternal principles, is to talk like a knave or a fool.

Upon this universally exercised arbitrary power is based the despotism of all tyrants ; and if it be wrong in a crazy king, it is equally wrong in a supposed sane John Smith or Brown, the scavenger. The insane acts of petulance of Philip II. of Spain, Henry VIII. of England, Louis XII. of France, Caligula, Nero, Tiberias, Pope Gregory the Great, and other popes and sovereigns, Theodore of Abyssinia, or Soulouque, — crazy claimants to "universal dominion," — down

to the miserable wretches occasionally discovered and punished for whipping and torturing children and dependents, are all fruits of the insufficiency of the law to give that natural protection which belongs by right to every human being. And civilization can only be measured by the progress made in the national social system in that respect.

To the clergy of every denomination, and of every part of the world, must be attributed the infatuation of adoration for "power and authority," which St. Paul says, Christianity was "to put an end to." This idolatry, as already remarked, is attributable to the fact, that they believe their social and pecuniary interests are improved thereby. The true liberty of religion is not comprehended by them. The vanity of personal popularity ; the pride of dictating to their flocks, blind them to the truth, and make them instinctively hate the freedom of others.

To Frederick the Great is attributed the remark : "that all men are equal, and that high birth is only a chimera, when not supported by merit."

Mr. Motley, in his history of the Netherlands, alluding to the unrestrained whims of Philip II. of Spain, whose cruelties, butcheries, and barbarities of every kind were coupled with a fiery conceit of religious zeal, says, "There is no doubt that while comparatively powerless for good, the individual despot is capable of almost indefinite mischief. . . . His reign was a thorough and disgraceful failure. He had spent his life in fighting with the spirit of his age — that invisible power of which he had not the slightest conception ; while the utter want of adaptation of his means to his ends often bordered, not on the ludicrous, but the insane."

Patrick Henry, speaking of the imitation of monarchy in this country, said : "Away with your Presidency. It will end by destroying the republic." It is certain that a mere change of name does not change the action of a government, *where the laws and usages remain the same*. Hence the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848 in France, ended in restoration of Monarchy, because no fundamental principle of governmental rule was modified. The great Revolution of 1789, on the contrary, although ending in Monarchy because the despotic principles of individual power in every class, remained the same,— and therefore, particularly so in the Government, — left a social system so modified in regard to the property interests of one man with another, that no reaction or revolution of the Government has been able to restore that portion of the feudal system.

Have we any of this one-man power "so powerless for good" but

"capable of infinite mischief?" Will not individuals, to whom the nation imprudently gives unnatural power, "be ever fighting with the spirit of the age?" Are not the opinions and promises of the man out of office invariably very different from his actions and opinions in office? Ledru Rollin, the leader of liberals in France, tried in 1848 to make himself absolute. The menace of Arago's pistol checked him in his crazy opportunity. And in general, shall we not compare the petulant, impatient treatment of business, national and individual, as bordering less "on the ludicrous but the insane?"

A perfect type of the craziness of power is found in King Theodore, who writing to Sir R. Napier, says: "I had intended, if God had so decreed, to conquer the whole world, and it was my desire to die if my purpose could not be fulfilled." Alexander the "Great" (what?) dreamed the same folly. Pope Gregory, boldly declared for "universal" rule. The leaders of Mahommedan and other fanaticisms, the Lama of Thibet, and Micados of Japan, down to lesser saints of these times, have believed in opportunities to accomplish similar impossibilities.

Louis XIV., under the ignorant advice of priests, ruined his nation by the revocation of the edict of Nantes, driving from it the best blood, industry, and intelligence of the country. Protestant England profited extraordinarily by the blunder. Thus have millions of families, peacefully following their own duties, been made to depend upon the opinions, whims, caprices, and passions of individuals! Can any one-man power, by a professed attention to business for a few hours, verify a single fact brought before him? His signature is hourly appended to acts of which he can have no correct knowledge. It incarcерates in Bastiles or sends to Siberia numerous victims of private vengeance and calumny! Governing! nothing governs but the law when it positively protects every individual from the despots of another. All other government is craziness and fraud. When the individual is protected by every man doing his duty, "men in power" will never be pestered and bewildered by crowds of sorrowing and excited applicants for relief and protection. A visit to "a man in power" ought to suffice to cure any sane man of his erroneous views of human freedom under such a system.

Without wishing to destroy the delusions regarding "great men," or denounce too severely the idolatry for success, which the barbarous man entertains, it is well to bear in mind that a man is nothing without his opportunities. To raise oneself by advocating another's cause is an every-day trick. But a hero is not thereby created. An available

man may be exceedingly shallow. Take the most favorable case, that of Napoleon I., how small he appears when we read in letters and confessions the petty tricks and meannesses his most intimate friends disclose? Where is the true greatness? He who plays the hero must be well supported.

When Europe made war on France so many times, the genius of the country, its best talent and energy, its enthusiasm for home, and horror of feudal oppression, sustained, inspired and energized its leaders. Great men arose; but nearly all of them perished in name or fortune, destroyed by the jealousies of secret enemies. But for the persistence of Murat, Bonaparte's brother-in-law, a man not at all remarkable for mind, the usurpation of the 18th Brumaire would never have taken place, and in spite of his brilliant Italian campaign, Napoleon might have passed into comparative obscurity. In our civil war, how many earnest, talented men, were ruined by the jealousies of mere newspaper heroes! It is no exaggeration to say, that newspaper exaggeration excited the rebellion, and newspaper misrepresentation had well nigh made it successful.

Under the partizan representations of the press—in private as well as in public matters, the mere mouth-piece of monied influence—the people can rarely obtain the correct facts of a case. They have to rely chiefly on their own instincts, and in the end this may, though it does not always, set them right. Undoubtedly,

"If men when wrong beat down the right,
Would strike together and restore it,—
If right made might
In every fight,
The world would be the better for it."

If the sentiment attributed to Plato be true: "that insurrection in a country is evidence of bad Government," then our form, far in advance as it is upon all others, is by no means perfect. There must be much imbecility of self-conceit somewhere.

Governments have been founded generally without the consent of the governed. The conqueror, with the view of levying taxes, raising troops, &c., and, not knowing, and, if capable of knowing, unwilling to form a true social system, appointed agents, satraps, or secretaries to conduct the work desired. Out of these crude efforts of oppression arose all modern governmental systems, more or less imperfect, arbitrary, blundering, and dependent on the capricious whims of the master for the time being. Revolutions have changed men in power. Empires and Kingdoms have been called Republics, and Republics,

having the same practical defects of administration, have become Kingdoms and Empires again.

Parties, on which men calculate so much for change, are generally traitorous institutions. Just as a man, who connects himself with a so-called "religious" sect, is compelled to surrender private judgment to some wild creed or superstition of the ignorant past, so he who joins a party must accede to the platform, and blindly obey the selfish rule of a few intriguing men, who succeed in controlling it for their own personal interest.

That the world in its semi-civilized condition is directed into wrong channels cannot be denied. To preach or whisper a truth was almost certain martyrdom. Barbarous, or northern nations, for thousands of years, were constantly invading the more prosperous, rich, and civilized southern nations, and, when successful, destroyed or modified all their institutions. The History of the Dark Ages could not be written without offending the barbarian in authority. Every tyrant in place is a hero to his biographers. Fables, poems, and nursery-tales were the chronicles, sacred books, and histories of mankind for many centuries. The boasted scholarship of the clergy has its dark side. There was probably more truth without than within the pale of its influences, and it would be difficult to find a work of any importance, sacred or profane, that had not been mutilated to make it conform to the infidel church interests of the time.

All executive power, as now constituted, is of *its nature* encroaching. It is always on hand, and can be always acting. Unchecked it necessarily acts according to its temporary interests. Legislative power depends more on jobbing, and party working. It is not more laws men require, but their fair administration — not the power delegated to a few to legislate away the land, that belongs to all, but the proper supervision of the official work of the government. The judicial power, in its position, is equally arbitrary, so long as its judgments, whether right or wrong, are irresponsible. Any judge-made law is absurd. The uncertainty thus created is the cause of the derision with which the public views the solemn farce. Shakespeare, Dickens, and numberless authors but express the general feeling.

"To put an end" to the demoralizing and *impoverishing* influences of "rule and authority" is the problem to be solved in a free country under the beneficent progress of knowledge and science. To protect the weak and employed, in their natural rights, from the assumed rights of the rich and strong. To educate men and women to dare to think and do right in spite of impious sectarian and legal persecu-

tions. To establish laws and usages to protect the people against the administrators of laws is of more importance than to make new laws which only entrap the weak and unfortunate. It were better and more rational that every individual, and we all pretend that men have equal rights, should have the power to call together at the moment of a difficulty, and when alone it can be understood and righted, a Jury of his friends, to examine and decide the case according to Law and justice ; rather than put him and his country to litigious expenses, and look for a decision, when every fact being changed or forgotten by delays, success depends upon tricks and monied influences. And when the two Juries cannot agree, let a conference-Jury decide. Why depend upon a one-man opinion, when that man fears a rowdy more than an honest man, or knows that he will gain by deciding jesuitically for the rich against the weak ? Has not the feudal judicial system tortured the law enough ? Give us Christian freedom. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty."

CHARLES L. ALEXANDER.

B E R K E L E Y.

BERKELEY has better claims, in my judgment, to the name of metaphysician than most of his countrymen. He, first of his nation, dealt face to face with ideas as distinguished from scholastic fancies and common notions, and thus gave them their place in the order of mind ; and this to exhaustive issues, as his English predecessors in thought had failed to do. His idealism is the purest which the British Isles have produced. Platonic as were Cudworth, Norris, Henry More, in cast of thought, less scholastic than Taylor of Norwich,—who was an exotic, rather, transplanted from Alexandrian gardens,—Berkeley's thinking is indigenous, fresh as his adopted Erin ; strong in native sense and active manliness. His works are magazines of rare and admirable learning, subtleties of speculation, noble philanthropies, and deserve place in the scholar's library, were it but to mark the fortunes of thought, and accredit the poet's admiring line :—

" To Berkeley every virtue under heaven."

A BRONSON ALCOTT.

T O - D A Y .

O RIVER, in whose bosom lies
The soft enchantment of the skies,
Give me thy rest, just for to-day;
The nameless faith that charms thy way.

O crystal-footed waves, outrun
The fleetest coursers of the sun.
To-day I fain would follow thee,
Exultant, mutinous for the sea.

O tides, that lift your treasures rare
"Into the bosom of the air,"
To-day, faith-held, I mount with thee,
On viewless wings, fearless and free.

The morrow's sun may dim my eyes,
Or glad my soul with sweet surprise;
A breath may sweep my feet away
From the worn paths they tread to-day.

Yet what have I with hopes and fears ?
Is justice meted out by years ?
Shall the dead centuries lend their sway,
To bend my purposes to-day ?

Great Source of life ! Great Love divine !
Thy laws immutable are mine.
I mount, I fall, I weep, I pray :
Thou art forever, as to-day ;

And up the golden heights of hope,
Transfixed upon the mountains' top,
Faith sees the beacon-light alway,
The confluent waters hide to-day.

L. T.

CAN SCIENCE SAVE ?

CHURCH history furnishes the following anecdote : A French baron of the middle ages, a religious enthusiast, anxious for the more speedy salvation of the world, hit upon an original method towards aiding its accomplishment. Being possessed of ample means, he fitted out several vessels which he despatched to different heathen lands with orders to kidnap full cargoes of natives. On their arrival at his castle, the astonished pagans were at once baptized by immersion in a large tank in the court-yard, the worthy baron chuckling meanwhile over the thought of having thus easily made them Christians without their knowing it.

Novel as this expedient seems, it is not without a parallel in our own day. "To make haste slowly," to "Follow, not force, Providence," is still one of the hardest out of many hard lessons which the reformer has to learn. Now as then, there is a generous rashness which would storm the strongholds of evil, and take them by assault : the feeling, however praiseworthy, needs the disastrous repulse it is sure to meet to teach it that its own impatience is no less an evil.

The baron's scheme for "saving souls in bundles" was undertaken in the interest of a theology not yet obsolete, which endeavors to rescue man from the vengeance of an angry God while leaving the man himself unchanged. A similar attempt is now making in the interest of a theory which treats circumstance as the creator of character, and endeavors, by informing men's minds and improving their condition, to gradually regenerate their lives. In itself this theory is not new. Its originality consists in the form in which it is presented, and in the claims made for it. But were it destitute of all intrinsic import or excellence, — and the reverse is true, — yet its growing popular favor, together with the recognized ability, earnestness, and candor of its advocates, would be in themselves sufficient to secure for it the public attention and careful thought it so fully deserves.

But just here one cannot forbear asking whether the world is likely to be benefited by the method these philanthropists propose. Their aim is reform. With the spirit of the movement all can heartily

sympathize. But are the means they would employ adequate to the end they would attain? For when they speak of reform they use the word in its primary and unperverted sense. They mean by it not a pitiful stooping to regain something lost, but a hopeful step forward and upward. They use the term, too, in its generic and radical acceptation. They would correct particular abuses and remedy specific wrongs as a skillful physician often finds it best to treat local disease, not by the amendment of parts, — patching here a little and there a little, — but by bringing the whole social body into a state of greater constitutional vigor. Thus defined, reform is full of strength and cheer. But, precisely because it is so, does it not imply the exercise of a power which no philanthropy can supply; which cannot, in fact, be supplied from without, but which, if exerted at all, must be the free play of individual volition made profoundly sensible of its own great need, and striving with all its might to satisfy it?

For every reform in its beginning is both a confession and an aspiration. It is a confession in so far as it declares that human life can find content only by continually advancing upon itself; it is an aspiration in so far as it steadily labors to create and vitalize a new or *reform*, corresponding to a higher principle of reason, and a purer energy of will. This term then rests on a common fact of consciousness, on a fact older than the most ancient theory, and significant as old. Because it has its basis in human nature, it is universally intelligible. Differ as we may in other respects, we all agree in this inward necessity of moral growth. On this account let our opinions concerning the origin and purport of matter and of man be what they may, let us assume the name of Theist or Atheist, Christian or Infidel, Spiritualist or Materialist, or let us go further and reject any doctrine on these points as an insufferable impertinence, and any philosophy of life, whether it bear the title of Optimism, Pessimism, or Meliorism, as a mere trick of words which the ever greedy grave mocks with hollow echo, yet reform shall still remain an intelligible expression. All can translate it into the simple but emphatic language of personal obligation. Conscience interprets it to each with the blunt directness of Nathan's "Thou art the man." For casting out the flagrant crime and ever-varying shapes of vice patent to the dullest vision; treating them, if you will, as wholly abnormal and exceptional; casting out, too, whatever conflicts with a fair and complacent morality, — there still is left the consciousness that there is a better than our best; still the feeling will come up that "our best" even is but transient and infrequent. This consciousness never fails to provoke the question, What

shall bridge the chasm between my actual and my ideal self? what shall make my will one with the Supreme Will and the Supreme Good? Is it motive or is it knowledge that is chiefly lacking? Is it spiritual impulse or intellectual instruction that is first required? Is it a diviner influence or is it greater familiarity with "natural law" which shall bring into activity the longed-for power?

Here we are brought face to face with two distinct agencies, one of the heart, the other of the brain, one known as Religion, the other as Science. Between them there need be no hostility and no jealousy, for one is the indispensable complement of the other. Their apparent occasional opposition is but the friendly antagonism of right hand and left, either being able to lay hold of truth, but both being needed to comprehend it in its integrity. But, being counterparts, they are never resolvable the one into the other. It is the office of the first to minister to being, of the second to call into activity the faculties of knowing and doing. The province of science is that of the understanding and the reason, and hence of the determinate quantities and established orders with which these are alone competent to deal. Science explicitly disclaims any attempt at reaching the causal springs of existence. It makes no account of spontaneity. The prevision which Comte declared to be its aim is prevision based on knowledge of phenomena. It is ability to reckon from a near effect to a distant one. It observes and combines, but it creates no new elements. Science is conversant with methods and utilities. It handles matter, molds form, directs and economizes force, abolishes distance, dispenses with time, turns stones into bread, weighs the sun, makes the invisible visible, puts pain to sleep, postpones death, formulates the laws of thought, and now for its last and greatest task undertakes to ascertain the organization and purpose of society. But into the realm of spirit, science does not penetrate. What new discoveries may be open to us, what new triumphs of skill may be in reserve for us, who shall dare predict? But let them be what they may, let them be brilliant and helpful beyond all that we now know or can imagine, yet there is a limit, as to the rising tide, which shall not be passed. There shall be no science of patriotism, of friendship, or of love. There shall be no science of pity or gratitude, of sin or sorrow, of reverence or worship. There shall be no science of the coming and going, or of the silent influence of that Power, which is within the soul and yet above it, which refuses to be analyzed by the spectrum, or weighed in the balance, or dissected with the scalpel, or reduced to a formula, or added to, or subtracted from, or multiplied or

divided by any cunning calculus; for this Power, and all in the human breast which is stirred by it, yields to no solvent save to one higher than itself, and higher than it mind cannot rise.

Nor is this limitation of science any disparagement to it. As it does not detract from the worth of the eye to say that its function is to see, but not to feel, neither does it detract from the honor of science to affirm that it relates to thought and action, to matter and force, but not to emotion. To the mariner, rudder and sails are equally useful in reaching his port, that humanity may not fail of its destined end; intellect is given to quicken, and sensibilities to impel. A French essayist has well said, in defence of culture, that a world without knowledge would be as incomplete as a world without goodness. Particular theories may be deciduous, and, having had their brief season, may fall into decay; but science is subject to no such melancholy change. Interest in it can never for an instant flag. For so long as man shall have physical wants; so long as he shall continue to be moved by irresistible desire to enter into and possess nature's "open secret;" so long as he cherishes the conviction that he who searches for truth of whatever kind co-operates with God and "thinks his thoughts after him,"—so long shall he be encouraged to advance from victory to victory until the loyal elements acknowledge him as master, and make haste to do his bidding.

But true science has nothing in common with that uneasy curiosity which is as heartless as restless, and is fitly represented only by "one who would peep and botanize on his mother's grave." On the other hand it has nothing in common with that well-meaning but crude materialism which sometimes usurps its name. For materialism never gets as high as mind, but stops short with a highly developed nervous system. In its view, man is simply a brute able to walk erect, who possesses a perfected thumb, a tongue that articulates, and a three-storied brain. It has faith in no fact not gross enough to be stumbled over. The grand purpose of life, according to its theory,—and its practice is consistent with it,—is to accumulate *things*. It delights in whatever feels smooth, and tastes sweet, and looks nice. With all its boasted enlightenment, it is full of superstition. Its religion is a disguised fetishism which grovels in the dust before the works of its own hands. Did it have the power, it would revise the beatitudes, and substitute "Blessed are the comfortable" for "Blessed are the poor in spirit." It believes in America agriculturally, commercially, and, so far as it gets office, politically. It outwardly patronizes what it calls "the institutions of religion," but in secret it

considers the steam-engine to be the true American God. It repeats its creed and litany with sonorous unction :

"I believe in all the gases
As a means to raise the masses.
Carbon animates ambition ;
Oxygen controls volition ;
Whatsoe'er is great in men
May be found in hydrogen ;
And the body, — not the soul, —
Governs the unfathered whole."

While waiting in a car-station one day, I noticed on the wall an advertisement of a new labor-saving invention. The advertisement was illustrated by a large photograph of the inventor, and his machine. The picture was a good one, and judging from it, the invention appeared to be well adapted to the work to be done. But it was the machine only that was distinctly visible. The maker stood in the back-ground almost lost in its shadow. He seemed an appendage — and not an important one — of the apparatus he had constructed. Was not the picture typical of a tendency of our civilization ? a tendency to exalt mechanism above manhood ? a tendency all the more to be dreaded because of its numerous and powerful allies in practical every-day life.

For, however it may be in countries where a genial climate and a teeming soil spread a free and bounteous table under a perpetual summer sky, here at least nothing is to be had for the asking. New England's only natural production is opportunity to work. In this opportunity, when cheerfully accepted, lies her lasting wealth and her real greatness. In it, too, is her danger. For with us there is always danger that sharp necessity shall goad one on from toil to toil, until like the beast, he spends the whole of life in sustaining life. We do not need lessons in materialism. Hunger, and Cold, and the Tax-collector will not fail to remind us that we are in the flesh, and that while we continue thus, the earth has claims upon us as imperative and persistent as those of gravitation. To republican ears, the poor-house has an ugly sound. There is nothing inviting in its dreary charities, or in the rusty hearse which brings them to a close ; but, bad as it is to be a pauper, there is a worse poverty possible, as he discovers — perhaps when too late — who sells his birth-right for a mess of pottage. Since Socrates adjudged himself support at the public expense as reward for teaching unpopular truths, the wise man will not hesitate — if need be — to vote himself a similar mainte-

nance, knowing that the poor-house offers at least this advantage ; it gives one leisure to think, and to get acquainted with *himself*.

At one of the Anniversary Meetings held in Boston last spring, Wendell Phillips related an incident of a recent trip West. It was substantially this : " I met," said he, " in a thriving town in Illinois, a wealthy, but intemperate farmer. We had some conversation on the subject of Prohibition, and in the course of it the farmer remarked, ' I suppose I am worth something like two hundred thousand dollars, and I would gladly pay the whole of it to-day to any one who would give me the power to pass that grog-shop yonder without going in.' " Said Mr. Phillips, " I replied, we can't give you the power to pass it, but I'll tell you what we can do, we can enact a law that will shut the door of that shop so that neither you nor any one else can go in."

No better illustration than this could be found of the two methods of reform — that which Science undertakes, and that which Religion inspires. Science takes its stand on some external circumstance, and assuming the impossibility of man's doing anything for himself, it endeavors to do for him. It labors by getting a leverage of favorable conditions to pry a passive subject out of the mire of folly and iniquity, and set him on his feet again, meanwhile filling up the bog so that he cannot wallow in it, even if he wills. This is all good — as far as it goes. But how much it is really worth, John Bunyan told us when he said he tried it, and found that in the end, " It was only a little cleaner way to go to hell in." What shall it profit one, though the whole world help him, yet he does not help himself? And how shall the whole world hinder him who calls to his aid a motive which sensualism cannot bribe, and which has no *self* to save? Science with noble intent begins wrong. Had any one told that Illinois farmer that he could kill out Canada thistles by cutting off their tops, he would have laughed outright. Experience would have taught him that if he would rid his fields of them, he must go to work radically — he must begin at the root. Why should he hope that shutting the grog-shop door would do any good unless he first shut the door of his own heart against evil desire? Let him do that, and the door of the grog-shop — yes the doors of all vice — would speedily shut themselves for lack of patronage. Jesus declared that it was not from without but from within that the influence comes which defileth a man. The inference is obvious. Science may cure many ills, but it cannot cure a corrupt spirit, nor can it heal a wounded one. There are voids which it may happily fill, but there are other and greater ones whose want and loss no culture and no skill can relieve. Fortunate is he

who is persuaded of this truth ; more fortunate still he who realizes it. In every reform which Science undertakes, there is a fatal defect ; for at best, Science but removes temptation ; Religion overcomes it.

There is a true and there is a sham philanthropy busy in the world. The first sees clearly that what is needed is, to quote the thought of Pythagoras, to help men to take up the burden of life, but not to help them in laying it down. The second, through a weak and nervous, sympathy cockers and cossets all those unfortunate unfortunates who fall into its hands.

"I like reforms but not reformers," said Thoreau. He had probably met some of the amiable Mrs. Jellybys, who not being able to do anything for themselves have a morbid propensity for running about to "aid" other people. Of these, it is safe to say society already has enough. We have enough too of those who are in the moral pattern business ; whose ambition is that which Coleridge described when he said four fifths of his congregation came to church to set the remaining fifth an example. But we have not enough of that hearty faith in human possibilities which works not so much for, as with, the world, believing in co-operation but not in compulsion or condescension. The philanthropist who forces or who coaxes, has his labor for his pains ; let him trust boldly to the excellence of his cause to recommend itself.

Means and end, such is the final resolution of the whole matter. "What am I here for?" is the mute inquiry the mother reads in her child's wondering eyes. Later, as the stern but beneficent conditions of life make themselves felt and known, there comes a second question often so urgent and imperious that it crowds out the first—"How shall I live?" A question which may go no further than desire for daily bread, or may extend infinitely. Let social science — let philanthropy answer this last appeal. Let them declare the laws of labor, of health, of longevity. Let them discover and publish the means whereby each human being shall be able to feed, clothe, shelter, and educate himself. Let them do better ; let them open up ways now unjustly monopolized, so that to all, fair and equal opportunity may be given. Let them demonstrate past all gainsaying that civilization is not a greedy scramble in which by mutual agreement, each endeavors by every possible means to out-do and out-wit his neighbor ; but rather an intelligent general effort with the understanding that the welfare of the whole redounds to the benefit of each, and that the purpose of each is to find his place and fill it. On the other hand, let them, as Charles Kingsley has said, wage a sacred

crusade against dirt, degradation, disease, and death wherever found. Let them hold out a friendly hand to every perishing man or woman, and to every neglected child. Let all this be done steadily, cheerfully, and wisely, as may be — each one of us taking it on himself to do what in him lies — bearing in mind, meanwhile, that in accomplishing this work we are not living — we are only getting the means whereby to live.

In "Wilhelm Meister," Goethe punishes irreverence by denying the offenders the privilege of showing reverence when they wish to. Church and community are suffering a like retribution now. Having paid long and servile deference to expediency, and having refused to respect any truth which would not wear its livery, they are now denied the privilege of openly acknowledging and reverencing somewhat that is better. In order to reach what is in itself worthy, they are often compelled — or feel themselves to be compelled — to make use of unworthy measures. Freedom of action and frankness give way to scheming. Our business and our worship have too much compromise and reticence for thorough self-respect. "Not lack of faith, but lack of faithfulness," is the great difficulty. And this recalls the first question — for at last it all comes back to that — "What am I here for?" That is the topic which each one is called to discuss with himself. Am I here simply that I may be happy? No. Hegel says the happy periods of human history are its least fruitful ones. Am I here to live for private ends and personal aggrandizement? Ask him who has reached the limits of such a life what his conclusion is? Am I here for the sake of others? No more than they are here for me. Not at all, if by others those are meant who demand of me the sacrifice of my true and proper self to their whim. I am here to live in accordance with bounds of sense and time, and yet to live superior to both. I am here to live as Spirit prompts. If my obedience is complete and glad, no further salvation is essential.

DAVID H. MONTGOMERY.

THE HISTORICAL CONTINUITY OF RELIGION.

II.

SUPERSTITIOUS OBSERVANCES.

THE existence of the primitive religious instinct among a people is not necessarily accompanied by religious observances. As we have already seen, there are a great many peoples who have no forms of worship. If savages are so situated that they are not greatly obstructed in their attempts to procure the means of satisfying their wants, they would not probably inaugurate superstitious rites to propitiate evil beings and secure their favor. Even if such should come in contact with superstitious observances in others, they would scarcely adopt them even then, if usually and easily successful in procuring the means of living. Most that the savage wants is satisfied with something to eat and drink. His very heaven is a place where he can triumph over his enemies, and gratify his appetites and passions. Let us distinctly impress upon our minds that the religion of primitive peoples has no other than physical motives, physical welfare, success in adventure. For though, in his religious exercises, he is seeking to propitiate a power which he recognizes as superior to his own personal power, it is physical and not spiritual welfare he has in view. "It is clear that his physical well-being alone influences his religious ideas, and secures their power over him." There is enough of this even in the worship of civilized peoples ; but, amongst savages, it is this and nothing else. Their minds do not rise to the conception of the spiritual interests of a soul in the far-off future. We have great need to guard against the habit of attributing our own psychical experiences to peoples who by the necessity of their mental organization are utterly incapable of such experiences.

If the instinct of mysterious powers be co-extensive with, and an essential part of, religion among primitive peoples ; and if there are such peoples without religious observances, as we have abundant testimony to prove that there are, — then may not these religious observances be an after development? First, the instinct of adverse or evil powers ; and then, secondly, the happy instinct — idea it cannot be called — that these beings, like ill-disposed men, may be influenced

by certain observances which are calculated to give them pleasure, or inspire them with fear. It is said that the Hottentots have some idea of a Deity, but no observances which they will admit to be of a religious character. They live in one of the finest climates in the world, and can probably always satisfy their very primitive wants without an appeal to that Deity of which it is said they have some notion.

Those religious rites which have grown out of the feelings of thankfulness and obligation do not, of course, belong to those undeveloped peoples who have no words to express such moral ideas. And inasmuch as the idea of goodness in God is a later development than the notion of badness in the mysterious beings of the primitive imagination, so is the religious expression of gratitude and later development than the sorcery which is practiced to divert the attention of evil beings, or the intimidation which is used to bring them to terms.

III.

THE BELIEF IN A FUTURE LIFE.

Still later than the conception of physical and present good, as dependent on the whims of the fetich gods, is the conception of spiritual good in a world to come. Still later than the institution of superstitious rites appears to be the conception of a life other than this. We find the belief in a future life oftener absent than any other of the principal religious beliefs. Its character appears to be more phenomenal than any other, and less essential to the religious instinct. While the mind is so infantile and vague as in the lowest races, it is not to be supposed that it will look far ahead in this life; but rather exist from day to day, not thinking of the morrow, to say nothing of thinking of another life after this one is ended. The Carib who will sell his hammock cheaper in the morning than in the evening, not thinking twelve hours ahead, will not be likely, of his own accord, to be greatly concerned about the eternal realities of another world. The physical benefits to be obtained by the practice of religious rites among primitive peoples are such as are wanted and expected the next hour, the next day, perhaps the next week. Certainly these people do not invest religious capital for a "long run," even in this life, and still less in the life to come.

I. THE CONCEPTION OF A FUTURÉ LIFE DEPENDENT ON INTELLECTUAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

The conception of a future life implies a considerable degree of

intellectual and emotional development. Without sufficient intellect to cause reflection about life and its phenomena, and without greater strength of the affections than most savage tribes evince, there would be no thought about a far-off future life, and consequently no desire of personal immortality. Without this desire, the phantoms of the dead, which may, perhaps, appear in dreams to savages as well as to ourselves, would not be suggestive of continued existence of such character as to be desirable ; for, after all, it is the desire of immortality, rather than the evidence of it, that renders the belief in it now so general. While man's life is merely animal, while his attachment to his fellows is little more than a gregarious instinct, it is the present and himself, and not the future and his friends, that concern him ; and entire tribes of such would be without the belief in immortality if they had not learned it from more advanced peoples, and abased it to the level of their own sensuous ideals. The numerous tribes of mankind who have no notion of a future life are those who have not yet learned it, or have not yet advanced sufficiently far to have originated it for themselves. And these peoples, as we have seen, are those who live in the most out-of-the-way parts of the world, and in those regions which are least favorable for intellectual activity, while they are actually the most stolid of mankind. And for such people it is not so easy a matter to accept the doctrine of a future life at the mere mention of it by a traveler or missionary, since they have not yet grown into the aptitude for its reception.

2. THE BELIEF IN A FUTURE LIFE AMONG THE JEWS.

The Seelongs of India believe in good and evil spirits ; but they have no idea of an eternal life, and they declare that they do not think of it. The Jews had a God and a complicated ritual, when they had still no belief in a future life. They seemed to think that with the death of the body all was over with the individual. Elijah they could not let die ; but, in order to get him into the presence of God, they sent him up body and all in a chariot of fire. But even then, according to the tradition, the sons of the prophets were skeptical ; for they insisted on detailing a scout of fifty strong men to look after Elijah, lest a capricious whirlwind had cast him upon a mountain or in a valley.

The Jews were a people of strong personal affection, as shown by the despair with which they mourned the dead ; and that they had not yet developed amongst themselves the belief in immortality is a fact of especial significance. When they came in contact with the

Assyrians, and learned of them the doctrine of a future life, they adopted it only in a partial way, as they denied immortality to those who did not believe in the resurrection. And, in the days of Jesus Christ, the Sadducees still represented the old Jewish views on this subject, believing only in this life and the obligations of the law. Even among Christians in our own day, there are people who hold that immortality is not the consequence of a law, but is the reward of a living faith or of meritorious works. So tenacious is the impression that the soul cannot be fully alive without the body, that it has been a question among Christians whether the soul does not sleep till the day of the resurrection. The doctrine of the resurrection appears to have grown out of the idea that the soul could not be active without the body ; and Paul seems to have been influenced by this idea in urging the doctrine of the resurrection as an essential element of the Christian faith. (1. Corinthians xv.)

The fact that so many of the lower peoples of the earth, though not wholly destitute of the religious instinct, are yet without any conception of a future life, together with the example presented by the history of the Jews, seem very clearly to indicate that the doctrine of immortality is not an essential, but an incidental, element of religion amongst mankind. While it is a doctrine which peoples learn of each other, an idea which they may grow into, we are led to suggest whether it may not also be an idea which perhaps some peoples have already grown out of, and which still others are destined to pass through in the course of their intellectual evolution.

3. BELIEF IN A FUTURE LIFE AMONG THE BUDDHISTS.

It is with reference to this point that Buddhism more especially claims our attention. Since millions upon millions of human beings other than Buddhists have lived and died, knowing nothing of a life hereafter, and since millions are still living who do not believe in it, or who never think of it, it matters little, so far as the philosophy of the subject is concerned, what may be the doctrine of the Buddhists in this respect. It may be that of personal immortality ; and still, if religion be a universal element of the human character, the belief in immortality can neither be universal, nor an essential element of religion. That numerous peoples are yet so primitive and undeveloped that the brief curve of their career so far described has not yet carried them into the sphere of this idea, appears to be conclusively established by the evidence. We are now concerned with the obverse proposition. Are there any people on the earth whose career

of development, whether progressive or recurrent, has carried them through the mental phase to which this idea pertains? The study of Buddhism may afford us some light on the subject.

The form of immortality presented by the religion of India previous to the rise of Buddhism appears to have been a tendency in the direction in which Buddhism afterwards moved. The absorption of the individual soul into identical oneness with a pantheistic Deity is no very uncongenial progenitor of the Nirwana, or terminator of individual continuance, if that be what the Nirwana means. Original Buddhism was really a development from the current ideas, and was not so *outré* at first as it afterwards became. It assumed that matter was originally the only divine existence ; and was at first in a quiescent and conscious state, enjoying the bliss of the original nothing. When it passed into the active state, and became broken into the manifold forms of individual life, it lost its consciousness. This however, reappears in man ; the exalted end accomplished in him being the reproduction of conscious existence.

These notions were further elaborated by Katana, who held that consciousness was not an original attribute of matter, but that it first appears in man, and is caused by sensual perception. Matter is composed of atoms and forces which in the human organism develop into consciousness as an individual attribute ; but this in turn, with the dissolution of the body, forever disappears. This is called the Vaiceschika doctrine, and its principal schools are the Tscharvakas and Lokazatikas.

While Buddhism was a development from the theoretical dogmas of the Brahmins, it was at the same time a re-action against their arrogance and assumption in matters of a practical character. Its political feature was its democracy, its leveling doctrines. It abolished sacrifices, and opposed the privileges of caste and priesthood, and spread so rapidly that it soon became the religion of a third of mankind then existing.

The point of interest here is, that the doctrines of the Buddhists, and especially of Katana, appear to have been a development out of former ideas, which, though virtually individual annihilation, was yet a sort of spiritual or pantheistic immortality. Katana's doctrines appear to be a recognition of the forces of matter which attained to consciousness in man ; a consciousness, however, which ceases with the dissolution of the body. If this be a correct view of the doctrine of this school of Buddhists, we see at once how different it is from that absence of faith which obtains among primitive peoples. In the

one case, it is simply a consequence of mental inertia, of undevelopment and intellectual stolidity ; in the other case, it is an elaborate system of philosophy, affirming principles which the school held to be incompatible with the doctrine of personal immortality.

What renders it more probable that these doctrines of the Buddhists are a legitimate development from previous doctrines which were tending strongly towards them, is the fact that in our own times, in our own civilization, there is a marked tendency in the same direction. Scientific discovery and the more exacting methods of modern thought have led thousands into doubt concerning a future life ; skepticism having pervaded all the educated classes, not excepting even the clergy.

An additional confirmation of this view is that long previous to the rise of Buddhism the religion of the Hindoos had been going through a career of development. It was at first the fetich worship of the elements, of the heavenly bodies, even of plants. These early Hindoos had but a vague conception of personal immortality, if indeed they had any at all. It was rather the conception of a future life in one's descendants, as there was a past life in one's ancestors. We notice here the same absence of a definite belief in a future individual existence, which obtains among so many primitive peoples in our own times. But in India the idea became more definite and distinct, doubtless with the progress of civilization and intellectual activity among the people. In their history the idea had a career, vague at first, then more distinct, shading at length into pantheism, and closing in the Nirwana, the bliss of eternal sleep.

"Where the infancy of man is laid bare to us, we find him without the anticipation of a future individual life." If we could go back to absolutely primitive life in India, we should doubtless fail to find the least trace of belief in individual continuance in any form ; but this period of Indian history must remain forever a blank. But, in looking over such evidence of the historical development of religion in India as lies within my reach, I have unexpectedly found evidence of the rise of the belief in individual immortality ; evidence which is of the more value, since it subsists alongside of the evidence of decline in this belief among the same people, showing the career of the idea almost from its inception till its close, in the doctrines of Katana.

Additional evidence of this career is to be found in other countries where Buddhism prevails. The religion of the Burmese "is Buddhism in its simplest form, though amid some of the wild tribes it is mixed up with heathen rites and superstitions," indicating that these

may have been once prevalent, but have yielded to the progress of Buddhism. In the Island of Ceylon the old demon worship still exists along with Buddhism in its most radical form. Buddhism was not a native development in Birmah and Ceylon as it was in India, and the curve of the career traced by the belief in the future existence was no doubt less regular and complete than the same curve in India.

It may be a question to what extent the doctrine of personal extinction prevails or has prevailed in Eastern Asia. There is not much doubt that Buddhism in its original form involved the idea of personal non-immortality. That all who embraced the doctrine so understood it, is not at all likely. The uneducated millions, with bounding animal life in their veins, are too ready to believe what they wish ; and it would be almost a miracle if they had accepted in their full significance the theoretical abstractions wrought out by abstruse and ecstatic minds, and which involved the destruction of personal consciousness. Before the rise of Buddhism, the Hindoos held conflicting views concerning immortality. While there were two distinct views concerning absorption, there were some who believed in the continuation of personal existence separate from Deity. And, even when the doctrine of absorption is professed, we are quite inclined to believe, that though this doctrine involves the extinction of personal consciousness and personal existence, yet it would not be so understood generally ; but those believing it would entertain a vague anticipation of conscious ecstasy when merged into pantheistic oneness with Deity. When religious speculations reach this point, they are vague and filmy, and there is little knowing what the devotee promises to himself under the charm of a stilted phraseology. There is so much that is subjective in all religions, that, without an intimate knowledge of the psychical make-up of the devotees, we shall be sure to fail in our interpretation of their religious ideas. We cannot suppose that the masses of Hindoos and Buddhists fully understood and accepted in the spirit of their originators the more abstract speculations of the Brahmins and Buddhist leaders. Amongst the Buddhists there were no doubt classes, if not schools, who professed the Nirvana, and yet held to immortality in some form, pantheistic and personal.

4. WHAT THE DOCTRINE OF NIRWANA MEANS.

That the doctrine of Nirvana means personal extinction, we believe would never have been questioned, if it had not been for the fetich disposition so common, of seeing other peoples' religious

notions the color of our own. The authorities of Christian bias, however, differ in regard to the meaning of the Nirwana ; while the free-thinking authorities, so far as I know, all agree. Dr. Good, whose learning and piety will not be questioned, held that the Nirwana meant annihilation. Mang Shawloo, a Burmese disciple of Dr. Judson, who has been educated in this country under Baptist auspices, affirms, in a lecture on the Burmese, that a part of their religious creed is the annihilation of the soul.* The decided testimony of Max Müller was given in a former paper on the "Career of Religion." Judging from his writings, and from the fact of his being an Oxford professor, we take him to be a Churchman. Such also we understand Sir James Emerson Tennent to be, who spent many years, in an official capacity, in the Island of Ceylon, and studied the Cinghal-ese and their history with great thoroughness. Sir James says : "From the contemplation of the Buddhist, all the awful and unending realities of a future life are withdrawn ; his hopes and his fears are at once mean and circumscribed ; the rewards held in prospect by his creed are insufficient to incite him to virtue, and its punishments too remote to deter him from vice. Thus, insufficient for time, and rejecting eternity, the utmost triumph of his religion is to live without fear, and to die without hope."

Many other authorities apparently of a cautious and honest character might be given in corroboration of the above testimony ; but, if the above are not sufficient, more would not be. We are in no way inclined to present any speculations of our own to set one side the testimony of such witnesses as Sir J. E. Tennent and Prof. Max Müller, the one author of the best monograph in our language, and the other the greatest Sanscrit scholar of the age.

In our interpretation of Buddhist literature, we should make proper allowance for the lively and luxuriant imagination of eastern peoples. When we read that the Nirwana is "free from decay, knowing no restraint, and of great blessedness"; that it "is unmixed satisfaction, entirely free from sorrow," we may perceive that tendency of the mind, especially in the East, which gives life and animation even to nothingness. We see nothing unnatural in a careworn and exhausted mind in an old civilization, contemplating the cessation of existence

* "At the beginning of this century a theistical sect arose in Birman, where Buddhism prevails, which assumed an almighty and omnipotent spirit which created the world, and which also taught a species of immortality. The king burned fourteen of these heretics at the stake, and exterminated the sect. (See Ausland, 1858, No. 19.)" Büchner, Force and Matter, p. 212.

as the greatest boon, and speaking of it as a haven of repose, as an entity full of blessedness. But when we read, "Nirwana, like space, is causeless, does not live nor die, and has no locality,—it is the abode of those liberated from existence," we think there is no need of mistaking the sense. The very idea of the Nirwana is founded on the conception that existence is the one paramount evil, while the close of existence is the paramount good.

A point worthy of note in this connection is that in their higher speculations the Hindoos held knowledge to be the greatest means to the greatest end. It was through knowledge or wisdom that deliverance from the chain of transmigratory existence was to come. "By ignorance is bondage, by knowledge is deliverance." "Through knowledge the sage is absorbed into supreme spirit." This recognition of the intellect, as the means through which the greatest good for man is to be achieved, indicates an advanced stage of civilization. There is no hesitation here about the supreme good: it is the extinction of personal existence, and knowledge is the means thereto. We may realize better the significance of this Indian recognition of the paramount value of knowledge, when we reflect that in our own civilization belief has always been regarded of paramount worth in the attainment of human felicity, and that it is only within the present century that a few radical thinkers have dared to ascribe to thought the leading influence on human happiness in the aggregate.

Still another consideration has reference to what class of its people we should judge an age or nation by. By universal consent it is the intellectual class. It was the intellectual men of Greece that gave her character in the age of Pericles; it was the intellectual men of Rome that gave her character in the age of Augustus; it was her intellectual men that distinguished France in the age of Louis XIV.; and the same is true of England in the days of Queen Elizabeth. Dr. Draper affirms that "the leading, the intellectual class is always the true representative of a state," because "it has passed step by step through the lower stages, and has made the greatest advance." We believe the position to be incontrovertible; and, if it be, we may perceive more clearly the career of development in religious ideas in India from fetichism to polytheism, thence to pantheism, and finally to the Vaiceschika doctrine of Kanada. It militates nothing against this view to say that the ultra speculations of Gotama and his intellectual successors were never fully appreciated or understandingly accepted by all of the two or three hundred millions who embraced Buddhism. We do not consult the masses of Greece, Germany, and

Scotland, to learn what was the historical development of the Greek, German, and Scotch philosophy ; nor do we study it in its degeneracy, — we go to the fountain-head. To learn what the primitive church was, we consult the fathers. No one supposes that the masses of Christendom have ever understood the points of sacred logic over which the polemical bishops of Europe, Asia, and Africa quarreled for centuries. The career of a philosophy or a religion is to be traced in the footprints left by its masters ; and the religions and philosophico-religions of India present no exception.

J. STAHL PATTERSON.

NOTE. — If any one has entertained the least suspicion that it has been any part of the writer's intention to make out a case against the doctrine of immortality, he has wholly mistaken the drift of this essay. The attempt to write down religious opinions is a folly which he hopes never to be guilty of ; and surely no one can better afford than himself to refrain from interference with the religious opinions of others. But this subject of the historical continuity of religion is one which possesses much philosophical interest ; and, believing that the truth of history is better in the end than the fables of tradition, the writer has endeavored to prosecute the inquiry in the genuine spirit of science. He believes, furthermore, that upon the position taken in the essay, and upon that alone, can the historical continuity of religion be successfully defended ; for just so soon as we place the essential nature of religion in any set of ideas or beliefs, so soon does it become easy to show that religion — thus defined — is neither continuous nor universal. Our faith in religion rests upon a broader foundation than that.

PHILOSOPHY-LIFE.

WHATEVER the subject, theme, or topic,
Though brilliant the style, and kaleideoscopic,
Or simple the presentation,
We only repeat what another said
A month before, or perhaps have read
In some old *heathen* narration.

Word-painters all have we been for ages,
Poets, philosophers, lecturers, sages ;
And, willy nilly,
Always will we
Prove to be word-painters, till we
Reach this point in attainable knowledge, —
Hinted at only in school and college, —
Nature's law in every creature
Is the higher guidance. Teach your
Growing sons and daughters this,
This at least, if nothing more,
And the highest range of bliss
Man will reach, and not before.

It has been the fate of man,
Not so much fair truth to scan
As a naughty fact to ban ;
Offering, as reason for it,
This, the world is prone to wrong, —
Argumentum stufum, — or it
Would not have been wrong so long.

Ever solving,
Still involving
Periodical revolving,
Naught of mystery dissolving,
On some other soul devolving,
Still the question of existence,
But to meet the same resistance.

Questions vast, recondite, subtle,
 Flying thought's eternal shuttle,
 Ever strive to bridge the chasms
 Yawning o'er our mystic life ;
 Ending still in inky spasms,
 Fits of intellectual strife.

Sad and few words antidotal
 Of this poison of the brain,
 Racking life with weary pain,
 Have our prayers received in answer
 From the days of Aristotle
 Down to these of Combe or Spencer.

Victims now to small pretense,
 Yet trembling for the consequence,
 Meanly seeking for defence
 In some doled out Peters'-pence, —
 The heart-wrung wanderer's highway toll, —
 Or poor Sunday observation,
 Trusting to such conservation
 For the poor neglected soul ;
 Seeing shreds of their salvation, —
 If in nothing else but this :
 Sitting in a cushioned pew,
 Tranquil in the more than bliss
 Felt in wearing something new,
 While girt by walls all unprofaned
 By voice of any unordained.

O ever great vicarious Sunday !
 A wiper-out of scores thou art ;
 Taking burdens from the heart,
 Refitting it for Monday.

JOHN MCINTOSH.

THE RADICAL LIFE.

THE life is the growth of the soul from darkness into light. The outward or apparent life is the mere shadow of this, caused by the intervention of the grosser material between it and its spiritual source. The life is an aspiration, not an inclination to either personal or general desires that are dissonant to its grand theme. The life is strictly individual in its phases and experience ; a seclusion that God alone visits ; an isolation invaded by none, even in thought ; a grand interior drama, with the world for its "dramatis personæ," and every conceivable circumstance involved in its plot, yet no eye can witness, no tongue comment, no voice applaud, but one who is sole actor, receiving his cue from God, and who catches the voiceless echo, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord." The life is direct, not sinuous, unless perverted. It is for itself, and not to satisfy the demands of others. It is not conformable, for that is dissipation of its forces ; not popular, for that is paying homage to false gods ; and not politic, for that is the sum of all baseness. It is not understood, nor can be understood, for only the soul can interpret itself ; but its magnitude is yet greater than its grasp, and its resources than its estimates. It is the hidden jewel which eternity shall discover and polish, at once a mystery and a joy to its possessor. The soul is the true world wherein is contained the essence of experience. Before its august tribunal are tried all principles, under the inexorable laws ; and, when the verdict is rendered, the truth is proven trustworthy, and error fades into obscurity. This judge, who sits within, respects no assumption, no authority, no superstition ; but puts all things—opinions, faiths, practices—to the infallible test. It admits but one superior,—God ; and one interpreter of his design and purpose,—the soul. It disclaims all intervention, mediation, sacrifice ; it scorns to imitate, for its ideal is not without, but within,—the inherent nature growing in beauty towards perfection. It is self-contempt in a nature to worship any embodiment of moral and spiritual excellence, whether recognized in Scripture or history or life ; for spiritual altitude is not exceptional,—the tidal flow of every soul approaches the same high ultimate. It is possible for all, and the same high sense that realizes the beauty and majesty of

that one example proves in its *consciousness* the possession of identical elements ; for recognition is always reciprocal knowledge and attraction. There is no recognition between strangers, — they simply pass each other ; but the soul is not strange to its divine companions. Consequently, it is not the servant worshiping the master that is the true attitude of the soul, — for the servant cannot know the master, the low degree cannot comprehend the higher, — but the cordial grasp of brothers, a fraternal meeting of equal natures with identical possibilities.

Self-knowledge is the sum of wisdom ; for, in knowing ourselves, we comprehend all. Self-respect is the sole virtue ; for, when we realize our divine natures and their responsibilities, honor is spontaneous, and from honor based upon appreciation there is no lapse into folly or contempt. The loss of self-respect is the secret of all shortcomings. It is the quicksand from which extrication is impossible. It is the prevalent cause of all that we call vicious, imbecile, foolish, tyrannical, and neutral in society ; neutrality being perhaps the worst form of vice that we have to consider, for it is an adulteration of all elements, good and bad together, leaving not an atom pure enough for analysis. To respect one's self is to respect all divine attributes which are bequeathed to us from the Father, to understand and obey the infallible laws, and to permeate all acts with principle, all thoughts with wisdom, all feelings with love. Truth is integrity in all active manifestation to the divine principle. Truth is a unit, and ever harmonizes with itself. The radical is one who seeks for this inner guidance, outworking in his daily life the rectitude that his soul establishes. His code is within, his acts according to the spirit of the law. He is not abusive, nor intolerant, nor vindictive, nor an iconoclast in the world's sense. He does not denounce others nor proclaim himself, is neither a defamer nor an egotist. The persons who have been thus are not radicals, but society accuses of these faults many whose sole crime has been letting them alone thoroughly and entirely. Society seems to prefer a half contract with contention and argument, to a total separation with absolute silence and departure. Nearly all of the professing radicals are serving out their time with the old institutions, buying their freedom as the slave bought his of his master, with the wages of their more lucrative employment out of hours. All that they glean of valuable thought and worthy motive out-of-doors is carried back to the old moldy receptacles which they fail to refresh, simply wasting their own vitality. Of all neutrality, this is the saddest ; to try to serve two masters, and betray both. The radical has

simply nothing to do with the ceremonies, observances, customs, or opinions of society from the point that they swerve from the strict order of conscience. The radical lives in the present: his light is a constant revelation, and each revelation is a law of action to which he is accountable. He has nothing to do with tradition, for the truth of tradition he finds in the present. Truth is not showered as a deluge upon the earth at one season, to be followed by a long drought during the time to come. He has nothing to do with usage, for it is generally an incrustation from which the life has departed; as the locust, when he takes flight, leaves his shell upon the spot where he made his transit. He has nothing to do with opinion, for that is the egotism of personal and class interests. He admits no property in truth, no division nor hedges of exclusiveness: his truth, if it be true, is not his, but humanity's; he may have reached it earlier, or he may greet it in many a kindred spirit. His virtue is not peculiar,—neither a point of pride nor of adulation, but simply a healthful state of being.

In our high moments we imagine it the easiest thing in the world to be simple, loving, and true, that our acts should be naturally wise, and spontaneously attractive and winning; but we awake to the consciousness that virtue is the exception, and that all that we thought involuntary goodness was a rare manifestation of the meritorious in an occasional act which rendered the person illustrious. That it should be an extreme virtue to be an abolitionist, or a friend to woman, or an advocate of temperance and health reform, or an honest politician, or a fair tradesman, or an unprejudiced thinker, or a candid speaker, or a liberal man, or an independent woman, is proof enough of the degeneracy of our age. That the commonest ground virtues—in fact, no virtues, but the simple necessity of an honest nature—should be singled out as examples to be the standard of an ideal excellence that few are able to attain, is a shame for our humanity. We are all vagrants in a certain sense, picking an uncertain livelihood from the rubbish-heaps of the world. We are incapable of earning an honest living, for integrity is the farthest from our attainment. The radical is a person of integrity: he is not malleable under the world's forces, and can neither be bribed nor corrupted nor persuaded nor frightened into allegiance with any form of wrong. He is uncompromising; therefore hated. He is steady; therefore feared. He is clear-sighted; and his glance is deprecated. To walk uprightly in the way that he is sent, to preserve the peace of his own soul and the clearness of his understanding, to turn not back for the voices

that clamor execration and blame and abuse for the course he is pursuing, the world's voice will ever exclaim, "Thou fool!" but the soul beckons onward, and in that beyond there is a peace that the world knows not of.

MARIE A. BROWN.

DEATH.

DEATH is but a second birth, as natural as the first; not an evil, but a good; the only possible door to another world. We are exhorted to prepare for death, as if it were a merciless arbiter of human destiny, when in truth it has nothing to do with the soul's weal or woe. Its effect is physical, not psychical. It is only a means of passage from one world to another. New conditions may, doubtless will, work a change in the soul; but death, the means to those conditions, can, of itself, effect no radical change in the spiritual entity of man. Hence it would be more rational to exhort men to prepare to *live*, and to meet death as a necessary and salutary circumstance of life. Death is not a suspension of life, but rather a continuation of it. Progress is the law of life; and death is not in contradiction, but in harmony, with this law. Hence, whatever of good is gained in one stage of life is not lost in passing to another, else there would be no reason for existence.

Physical death is not a penalty for violation of divine law, inflicted by a disappointed and vindictive Deity. It is a part of the original plan of creation; for it is not possible to think that God intended that man should always live in a house of clay.

Death is as much the friend of him that sinneth much as of him that sinneth little; for, so far from its shutting the gate of all reform, it is not even a hinderance, but rather an efficient aid.

That instinctive fear of death which has been wisely given to man as well as animal has afforded an opportunity for a vast amount of imposition. Disrobe death of the artificial mantle with which ignorance and superstition have clothed it, and you would ruin every creed in Christendom; heaven, hell, and the judgment would be annihilated; thousands of pulpits would be struck dumb; men would profess less, and do more; and hundreds of thousands, whom fear has made hypocrites, would not be afraid to die honest men.

C. O. WHITMAN.

T H E L A K E .

NO breezes shake the drowsy lake,
For they have died in Autumn-land ;
The waters swoon in pulseless noon,
And round the misted mountains stand.

In broken lines the emerald pines
A-top the ridges undulate :
They sigh nor moan, they have no tone,
But tower steadfastly and sedate.

In love too fond the skies despond,
And half their dimness cometh down,
And, filtered through the upper blue,
The sun's glow scarcely can be known.

No life, no death, no bird, no breath,
Inade the sanctity so deep.
No skiff to make a marring wake
Across the surface sealed to sleep.

No scent, no sound, is hither bound :
Oh ! are we in or out of earth ?
And is this calm itself a balm,
The essence of a higher birth ?

The former day seems passed away,
Time's burden is a load of peace,
The indolence of life and sense
Seems wafted from the Indian seas.

Intoxicate with rest, elate,
My soul forgets the world at war,
And leaves behind the fates unkind
Dark-imaged in her evil star.

On higher thrones her past atones,
And triumph all excels her loss,
Her battlement towards heaven is sent,
And far below, the lake, her fosse.

The Radical.

And, if the stir of hope in her
 Would vent in warm volcanic cry,
 These slopes remote would hold the note
 And echo to eternity.

And it would shake the silenced lake,
 Nor leave a token of its sleep,
 While evermore up this dim shore
 The spirit of unrest would creep.

A. W. BELLAW.

SELF-RELIANT.

[A fragment of a thought of my good genius — myself: written on the back
 of my bill for hard-bread. C. O. D.]

GAITHER up your garments, seek no staff
 To help you in your career.
 Your God is always near,
 Central as a sun :
 Your Maker and yourself are one.
 Egotist, around yourself you spin,
 Yet reaching out to draw a universe within.
 The simplest food you fashion into bands
 As strong, more pliant, than walls of welded steel,
 Resistless as terwilliger.
 At corrosion laugh, since 't is to eat yourself
 Yourself to be.
 No bird 'mid air, nor air itself, so free.
 Who fed the ravens, feeds the ravens still ;
 Feedeth *me* when *I will*.
 A subtle myth, in circling, real becomes ;
 Self-sundering, self-uniting one.
 Where nothing is, the best of cheer
 With plenty ever standing near,
 In seeking action, finding rest,—
 No better Sangerfest.

JOSEPH H. SWAIN.

EDITORIAL.

PREACHING.

PREACHING is going out of fashion. That is to say, men are getting above the practice. Such as might have made first-class preachers fifty years ago are now very soon spoiled for the office. And those who, in other times, would have been well fitted to expound the Word, arraying in solid columns its formidable texts, are now regarded as of too prosy a class to edify the best half of the dullest or poorest country congregation. And this tells the whole story. It is one that is entirely creditable, as we must think, to the much-abused lay-people. They desire to be edified and instructed ; they like best to have their minister discourse of the nature of those things which pertain to the daily life, and pound less on the well-worn string that holds the fine detail of their duties. In short, they don't want to be preached at. They don't care to be put into the softened mood. They are no longer pious after the old sort. Their devotion is not of the formal outward character to be found in church observances. They do not care to be goaded on to *duty* : rather they solicit the services of those who can enlarge the boundaries of their knowledge, put them on a keener scent for the higher and nobler ways of life. Margaret Fuller's remark concerning Goethe, ' His God was rather the creative and upholding than the paternal spirit,' explains the character of present upward tendencies. And none the less so because the mass of people are yet crude and rough-mannered in the new way. All one needs to be reconciled, if he is not, to any extravagance of action or expression, is, the reflection that such superfluity runs itself out : when it has had that privilege, it is satisfied, sick of itself, and ready to be at rest. Extravagance cures itself by suicide. The over-

effort, the great noise, subsides in every one fit for an advanced culture: but most people go *through* these stages of experience to answer the ends of the creative and upholding god at last. The paternal god has his children more under control, sweeps them on with a more fatherly concern, and allows them no such freedom. He *enforces* silence, overawes rather than invites them to come to it through and out of their noisiness. It requires but little play of thought upon experience to say which method is effective and practical. The outwardly silent may be inwardly noisy, and remain so. The creative spirit, seizing them, will not be held accountable for any of their transition movements, for it lets them go free till they accord with its purpose of themselves.

Now, if it be kept in mind that the new demand which is made to-day, that which lies at the heart of all our experimental freedom, is truly the effort of a loyal impulse, wide-spread, working in and moving mankind at large to creative and upholding work for itself, we shall see that the pulpit, to hold any longer a position of importance with respect to this movement, has to learn new manners and new modes of thought. The ministry of reconciliation opens with an idea, not with priest or prophet. To discourse of that, and not to magnify the office by hitting the sinners, assuming such business to belong to the professional *rôle*, must become the practice, in obedience to the new dignity ascribed to human nature. A clergyman received an invitation to this effect: 'We don't ask you to come and preach *to* us, but *for* us.' It contained an assumption of more natural and helpful relations between clergy and laymen than parish committees often regard with favor.

It may be urged that we have overstated the case in saying that preaching is going out of fashion, when it is rather improving its fashion. It is in this way that the custom is disappearing. The sermon is cast in modern form. Who takes any interest now in textual argument and exhortation? Orthodoxy itself grasps our daily experience, and into this new mold crowds its old doctrines; they re-appear on the boards fresh and hardly to be recognized. Within a few years the process of a doctrinal revolution has gone rapidly on. The

war supplied a large amount of new illustration to take the place of the old stock. Isaiah and Jeremiah were here written anew, and from a better perspective. This modernizing of the sermon is not only effected by a nearer approach to passing, present occupations and interests: it is by serving the spirit of humanity, the equal concern of all people for adopting the best methods. Hence the tone of the sermon changes; it is more respectful to the hearer; it demands more of him; makes larger claims upon his intelligence: nothing very extravagant, as yet, in this respect, but the tendency is not to be mistaken. We have the more secular term of *audience* taking the place of *congregation*, also indicating a higher estimation of what people are worth. It puts them on more independent footing. Not to insist upon nice distinctions, the man who understands he is to speak before an audience, as the word commonly goes, speaks most to the purpose. There is something in the atmosphere of church congregations that clouds his faculties; a mock-piousness that is dwarfing to the man; you do not get his robust spiritual self, but a drawl of sentimentalism, light and airy strokes of rhetoric.

The changes we speak of are to a considerable extent going on in the churches themselves; but the movement is chiefly to be noticed in the democratic impulse that is stirring without. The activities of the unchurched proceed upon a more natural, and, we may say, elevated plane, and set aside the methods of the *preacher* as degrading their energy.

MANAGING THE PEOPLE.

THE vitiating thing that seems to go with the idea of church preaching, with the long-prevailing mode for saving souls, is the false character the pastor feels bound to assume in dealing with the culture of 'his people.' An exception is hardly to be met. You find at his post a considerate, concerned, gently leading *official*; but meet seldom the open, frank, truth-telling man. Mr. Martineau writes, 'The rarity with which doctrines

connected with morals and divinity are looked at, with a single eye to their truth or falsehood, is disheartening to those who know what this system implies.' The Catholic clergy of Europe are reported as finding it difficult to look each other in the face without smiling ; which means, translated, ' Of course we know each other. It is a rich joke ; but then it must be played for the sake of the dear people.' The Catholic clergy are, perchance, not less sincere than any other class following a similar calling. Perhaps it is not best to say of them, nor of any, that they are practicing deceit from an unworthy motive. It is so difficult to determine what constitutes an *unworthy* motive in such cases. If it were a simple case of open dealing, man with man, no one would be at a loss for a clear and decisive opinion. But the case is not a simple one. The administration of religion, like that of politics, is, in our day at least, a very much involved science. (We are assured that it *is* a science.) It implies fact, adroit manipulation ; it requires organization ; an institution. What else is it but the science of instituted religion ? This science, like every other, must have its *experts*. It must be worked. It is for this reason that it has been instituted. For whose benefit, if not for the 'dear people' s?

Now, everybody knows, if everybody believes what is said, that 'the people' have got to be managed. Their case is to be considered, and they are to be treated to such remedies as their symptoms may indicate. The state has a class of experts especially produced for this purpose. These statesmen know of the art, and practice it. They are grave and dignified, facing the populace. They speak with precision and with earnestness. On either side they have prepared a vast net-work of management : the 'election' will show which net has caught the most. Those statesmen, who chance to become the servants of the people, serve them ; if by deceit, yet *for their good*. Do they laugh among themselves, and esteem it a 'rich joke' ? Very likely. But they have a worthy motive that lies at the bottom of all else. If the people were different, their office would be abolished. But the people are what they are, and can only be benefited by being managed : they must be in part deceived, or managing them becomes impossible.

The *experts* of the church know that their case is precisely the same as the politicians'. They, too, are burdened with the sacred duty of managing the people. The people are a queer set ; their managers smile. It is conceivable, too, that these 'managers' smile at their own little arts ; their cunning devices of initiation ; their 'spiritual strategy.' How well it has all worked ! The people have been wheedled into the faith, or into such faith as it is profitable for them to have and enjoy. Yes : there is *esoteric* and *exoteric*, what is *known* and what is *proclaimed*. A 'rich joke' for some ; for others, it is something only to be bewailed. Yet it is by no means certain that the side that sees the joke is not quite as serviceably in earnest as the side that *wails*. The Catholic, who meets his brother expert with a smile, some would regard as even less of a burthen to society than the Puritan who groans. He is light-hearted ; but not for that reason is he a villain. And, if he is, it is much easier to dispense with his services, than to shake off the sad, heavy load of stern goodness which settles down upon the people for their good, whose feelings they hate to wound because he has '*tried* to be so obliging.'

Let us anticipate the time when our teachers shall be less wise and more humble, when they shall not hold wisdom out of our reach.

W A I F S.

EMINENT men are often more abused by friends than foes. Their names become common and vulgar under the care or patronage of interested friendship. Great men get appropriated by parties and sects for certain private uses : their utilitarian character is presented until it happens, that, in spite of their real worth, such men suffer somewhat of every man's contempt. Take simple and familiar examples. Who does not recall in his own experience when he has been to another to extol his hero, and found how difficult it was to interest that friend favorably even in his hero's great virtues, to say nothing of his uses. The more praise you lavished, the less you made

the effect you desired. Your work was untimely and overdone. One don't like to be compelled into admiration, nor to seem only to reflect another's. He imbibes a dislike of the very man to whose virtues you set no limits. And it will take some time for his prejudices to wear away, though your hero indeed be the noblest of mortals. You may condemn him for this to your heart's content ; but he can justify himself to his own feelings, nevertheless. When you come to analyze this feeling, you trace it back, not to any want of respect for the virtues you have found so supreme in the character of your hero ; you meet with a sentiment of respect for human nature, its common dignity, and the spirit that is universal, which protests against the monopoly of all that is great and good in behalf of any one person. The recoil from your persuasions is nothing more than this desire to be just. Your conversation might run thus. Your friend speaks :—

“ You have a hero ; so have I.”

“ Mine is perfection itself.”

“ So is mine.”

This you will be no more likely to believe than he to credit your assertion ; or, not disputing him, you will still shed his enthusiasm, and not worship at his shrine any more than he at yours.

All is changed when you have not enlisted as a partisan. To trace the heroic vein, and to behold the virtues wherever they shine, is a natural delight. But when we come to house them all in one person, and stand about him heated with indignation because all others don't at our bidding come and worship, threatening them with dire calamities, condign punishment, or plead for him with them with tears in our eyes,—that is another matter. You had better go away, and leave your hero to speak for himself. He can do much the best. His attitude is speech. If he be truly wise and great, he will obtrude no assumptions of his wisdom and greatness on any, but permit every man to delight in his own discovery. Nor will he commission disciples to peddle his fame through the neighborhood. He charges all to ‘ tell no man.’

THE sublime figure of Jesus is brought down, broken and disfigured, and exhibited at every street-corner, and you are admonished to 'stand up' for him. He is the stock-in-trade of how many parties! There is a company going over the country with a 'great moral exhibition' of animals, on whose wagons are painted 'Scenes from the Holy Land.' A *runner* for this 'moral exhibition' is said to have declared that 'that takes first-rate.' A Boston preacher was recently told by the treasurer of his society that some of his people were giving up their pews, complaining that they had not heard the name of Christ mentioned for six weeks. 'Now,' said the treasurer, 'could n't you manage to bring it in oftener?' The class of people with whom the name of Jesus is so attractive that they delight in making him a common talk for commonest, meanest ends, or for the noblest, fail to see how profane a use he is made to serve. Their anxiety to have him praised betrays them. They damage him for their own benefit. Thus used, his name wakens no spiritual emotion. All panegyric of him is tainted with corruption. You smell the odor, and turn away to a purer atmosphere,—whether admonished by the menagerie wagons, or the placard at the prayer-meeting to 'stand up' for him, it is quite the same. An improved version would read, 'Stand up *with* Jesus.' But either phrase blazoned at every corner becomes vulgar and profitless. One says, 'Jesus I know, but who are these who cry out? I would stand up for him against these, his many friends, who traffic in his name.'

MOST children come to feel a certain disrespect for God, hearing so much said of his power and his wisdom and his goodness,—these things harped on and paraded become tedious and overpowering. I was told of a little girl who had heard the superintendent of the Sunday school expatiate upon the attributes of God until to her mind the subject became painful. She could not be profane, but she whispered in the ear of her teacher, 'I should hate to be so big.'

THE UNITARIAN CONFERENCE.

FARMER ALLEN — not ‘the wickedest man,’ but *Farmer Allen* the patriot and famous stump-orator in the neighborhoods round about Boston, — tells with effect of a ‘feller’ who replied, when told that his girl was homely, that he knew it, but ‘calculated she’d do to *begin* with.’ It would seem as though some such consideration led ‘radicals’ to follow the fortunes of Unitarianism, thankful for the smallest or humblest crumb they are able to wrest from the table of ‘our Lord.’

There has been recently another conference of the Liberal or Unitarian body in the City of New York. The ‘radicals’ are reported to have won a renewal of their confession from the conservatives to the effect that the bread and wine of their communion is only for such as feel inclined to partake of it. If they don’t wish to feed from the same table that the majority do, they are now again excused by the terms of their constitution. They plume themselves on being ‘children of the spirit,’ and think that that will do. We doubt not but they would like to have had it made known that this spirit is the spirit of God, and belongs not exclusively to any human being, but to all unto whom God offers it free of whatever tariff from whatever sect or single person. We suppose that it was to this end Dr. James Freeman Clarke was persuaded to offer the following ‘amendment to the constitution.’ At a former conference the radicals had urged an amendment to the preamble; on this occasion they adopted another course. Dr. Clarke said: —

‘I thank our friends for not asking us to alter this preamble in any particular. They are perfectly willing it should stand as it is. They do not want any alteration; they only want an explanation; and what they want is this. They want the following amendment to the constitution, as the ninth article: —

“ART. 9. To secure the largest unity of the spirit, and the widest practical co-operation, it is hereby declared that all expressions in this preamble and constitution are expressions only of the majority of the conference, committing in no degree those who object to them, and depending for their effect upon the consent they command, on their

own merits from the churches here represented or belonging within the circle of our fellowship."

"I cordially assent to that. I should be glad to have that made fundamental in the constitution, because it is what we all believe, and what we all say. Then there is this additional sentence:—

"‘And that we heartily welcome to that fellowship all who desire to work with us in advancing the kingdom of God.’"

It will be noticed that the new feature introduced by this 'amendment' is the desire to build up the '*kingdom of God*', whereas the old preamble favors the building-up of the '*kingdom of his Son*'. An Orthodox might have said, 'Well, 't is all the same. The Son is as much God as God is, and God is as much God as the Son is.' But the Rev. Dr. Osgood of New York knows better than that; so also does the Rev. Dr. Bellows. These gentlemen know, that, for all practical *Christian* purposes, the 'Son' is *more* God than God is, if we may be allowed the expression. To them the '*kingdom of God*' is a very indefinite term. It means a very wide door through which many may pass, the whole world, in fact; and find beyond, as Mr. Mayo said, 'a great Atlantic Ocean of all men's speculations.' The '*kingdom of Christ*' is a term that is hardly less indefinite; one that has well-nigh become, if not the ocean, the gulf-stream, of all men's speculations, and the Unitarian body is itself a fair illustration. From Dr. Bellows to Frothingham, and beyond, the stream flows on and away from 'Christ, the Lord and Master;' while Father Hecker undoubtedly believes that even Dr. Bellows is far removed from the fountain-head.

On Scripture grounds, little could be expected of Dr. Osgood, since there has evidently been to him but little given. But of Dr. Bellows, who has acquired so great a fame in both hemispheres as a champion of liberalism, a man of large and mature views, supplemented by generous impulses, dauntless courage, there was expected, by some at least, a very catholic, most magnanimous, and affiliating spirit. It must have taken the sanguine 'radicals' there assembled by surprise when he turned and stormed upon their sect so violently. If they remembered his letters from Europe, wherein he puts himself on record as having witnessed the degradation and enslavement of the

human intellect in Eastern countries to his satisfaction, so that he was fearful he had been too much inclined against the largest freedom himself heretofore, and was now ready to hold fellowship with *all seekers after truth*, confident that in the end only truth could be established,—if they called to mind those sentiments, and without doubt they did, their surprise, we say, must have been very great. Then, again, he had but the day before, as the 'Tribune' remarked, vaulted into the radical saddle, and desired that the young and flourishing Boston school should remain free of the antiquated Harvard 'duenna.' 'Hands off! old witch,' cried he; 'keep thy measuring-tape to thyself.' These things and stories of private letters extensively circulated, breathing friendly tones, had served their most to heighten happy 'radical' expectations. But fate governs.

'Nor fire, nor triple walls of brass,
Control the high behests of fate.'

So we find Dr. Bellows apparently driven by some power greater than himself into saying that if the amendment offered by Dr. Clarke passed, as he believed it would, he could not be so compromised, and must leave the denomination. His speech was such a one as could have been made by Dr. Huntington, who left the same denomination to take Episcopal orders years ago.

This speech seems to have turned the moderate conservatives in support of the proposed amendment. Rev. Laird Collier of Chicago announced himself as a conservative of the conservatives, but said, 'I cannot compel other men to be, and would not if I could. When I took my neck from one dogmatic yoke, it was not for the singular purpose of putting it into another, nor of forcing any one else to do so.'

From all accounts, it would seem that the 'radicals' could have carried their amendment by a large majority. But it is evident that they were, as the 'New-York Express' states, finally 'outmaneuvered.' Dr. Bellows, and the few faithful standing with him, gained their point. The obnoxious clause about building up the kingdom of God was stricken off, and the 'amendment' was passed by a nearly unanimous vote, Dr. Bellows concurring, as follows:—

Resolved, That to secure the largest unity of the spirit, and the widest practical co-operation, it is hereby understood that all declaration of this Conference, including the preamble and constitution, are expressions only of its majority, committing in no degree those who object to them, and dependent wholly for their effect upon the consent they command on their own merits from the churches here represented or belonging within the circle of our fellowship.

We suppose that the 'radicals' calculate that this will do to 'begin with.' But it certainly makes their position no less embarrassing, we should judge. They simply stand, as they did before, in the attitude of dissent from the doctrine of the preamble, and upon such terms are allowed to remain, for 'practical co-operation,' members of the body. It strikes us that they also should have had a *preamble*, or *something*, by which they could proclaim to the world that they are not simply flirting with a homely dame, but have as *bondfide* and honorable intentions as the brethren with whom they co-operate. Their dogma is 'the kingdom of God.' Looking upon the whole affair from a distance, we should say, that, either, when the 'radicals' can command the majority, the preamble will be changed to embody their creed, or they will place that side by side with the creed of the conservatives, or else they will remove altogether from both preamble and constitution every dogmatic clause whatsoever.

S. H. M.

SAVED.

THYSELF within
The central Sun,
The Universe
And thee are one.

The Virtues orb
Within the soul;
Their energy
Converts the whole:
Their raying light
Illumes all space;
Their solar heat
Is heavenly grace.

NO T E S.

TO THE PUBLISHERS OF THE RADICAL:

I HAVE been so much gratified in the perusal of a letter from "A Skeptic," and the answer (apparently written by a clergyman) published in book form, in London, under the title of "Liber Liborum, or a Friendly Communication to a Reluctant Skeptic," that I have been induced to copy portions from each, trusting you may think it worthy of a place in THE RADICAL.

The letter from the Skeptic occupies eight pages of the book, and the reply one hundred and eighty pages, so that, although what I have extracted may look formidable, it forms but a small portion of the work. It is curious as showing the changes that are going on in the sentiments of the people and the Church, the latter yielding reluctantly to a pressure they cannot withstand. I have given, perhaps, too much of a *one-sided* view of the contents of the one hundred and eighty pages : a good deal of it may be called "Orthodox," as those who may chance to read the book will find out.

C. W. PEIRCE.

PHILADELPHIA, September 1868. 621 Vine Street.

LETTER FROM A SKEPTIC.

The unbelievers of the present day, so far, at least, as I have come in contact with them, are not, as you seem to think, irreligious men. They are not mockers, neither do they sit in the seat of the scornful. Hundreds of them are at the present hour wearying their souls to solve the problem how to conciliate the convictions, to which the tendencies of the age have borne them, with respect for time-honored institutions, and tenderness for the faith of those whom they most love and honor. You would be surprised to find how many of these have been educated evangelically ; how many of them are persons of pure minds, generous, benevolent, and self-denying. They do not dispute that the Bible has, in many respects, a claim to be regarded as the first of books. What they deny is, its divine character, its authority, its infallibility. They are conscious enough of the darkness which, apart from revelation, hangs over the world in which they live ; but they do not see evidence that the Bible has removed that darkness. Anything, they think, is better than a gospel, so called, which is in fact no gospel or good news at all, since it consigns all but a fraction of the human race to irremediable sorrow ; which exaggerates human sin, and limits divine mercy.

We are ready to avow our belief that the Bible is responsible for the prevalence of the dogmas to which we object; and therefore, while we admit the good that is to be found in it, while we neither altogether reject or despise its teachings, we cannot allow it to be held in the estimation that has hitherto been accorded to it, nor can we permit either it or anything else to come between conscience and God. When we find in Scripture actions recorded and commended which are immoral, commands which are iniquitous, and statutes ordained which are unjust, we put them aside just as we should do if found in any other book.

On the question of inspiration, my own notion is that it ought not to be regarded as anything peculiar to the past, since we are all, in a certain sense, inspired. All truly great men are unquestionably inspired men. Do you not recognize this fact when you pray, "Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy holy spirit"?

The superstitions of other days will have to be given up, — the dogmas that were accepted on trust, the dreams of dim ages past and gone: but we will build on a surer foundation, — we will have a nearer and a dearer faith in One who speaks to his faithful sons *to-day*; and we will build our faith and hope on a better thing than an infallible book, — we will build on an infallible God, who will give to all who seek him the witness of his own blessed Spirit that "now are we the sons of God."

REPLY TO THE DOUBTER.

You do me but justice when you express confidence that I shall not attribute your intellectual wanderings to *moral* causes. I have no right to do this in any case. . . .

Whatever may be the cause, it is but too certain that in the present day, both at home and abroad, multitudes of religious young men, who a few years ago would have ranked as believers, are now, instead of attaching themselves to the Church, silently but rapidly becoming alienated from all Christian worship and communion. This general unsettlement of religious belief has grown *from within*: the outcome of it is a skepticism reluctant rather than aggressive, which in some of the best men is rapidly passing the border of intellectual hesitation. . . . The great question is whether the divine authority claimed in the Bible for prophets and apostles should be extended to all that is recorded in Scripture; whether we ought to affirm of "the book," that it is from first to last, and in all parts, the "word of God"; or whether we should be content with the assertion that it contains and embodies that word. If the former view be correct, it is infallible throughout. If the latter, its infallibility must be limited to certain portions.

We shall find the inquiry both interesting and important. Let us not be afraid of it. For the present, it is assumed that inspiration, and therefore infallibility, does not belong to the entire book; and, further, that a principle may be found, by the application of which, that which is inspired may be distinguished from that which is not. . . .

There was no fixed and unalterable arrangement of the sacred books, as that which is commonly assumed, anterior to the fifth century of the Christian era. To rest a claim for the inspiration of the entire volume on such a basis as this is weakness indeed. . . . From it may be excluded without irreverence, the merely historical, however true and useful; genealogies however important in their place; poems or proverbs, however wise. The distinction is not a novel one: it has been urged by some of the ablest and best divines the Church has produced. If, therefore, it be said, as it probably will, that any attempt to draw a distinction between different parts of the Bible — to separate the inspired from the uninspired, the divine from the human — renders the book, as a whole, useless to simple Christians inasmuch as they can perceive no such differences, it is enough to reply that this is not the fact, since that which was true of the *oral*, is equally true of the *written* revelation. The exhortation of the Apostle John was, "Try the spirits, whether they be of God: believe not every spirit." "The anointing which ye have received from the Holy One abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you." We call this "the verifying faculty," and regard it as being neither more nor less than *reason enlightened and sanctified by the Holy Spirit*. To vilify reason, as so many good but ill-instructed Christians do, is a folly which would be unpardonable if it did not commonly arise from sheer ignorance or weakness of mind. As Butler truly says: "Reason is the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything, even revelation itself." Its duty in relation to Scripture is to judge, not whether it contains things different from what we should have expected from a wise, just, and good being, but whether it contains things plainly contradictory to wisdom, justice, or goodness, — in other words, to what elsewhere God teaches us of himself. As it regards certain miracles recorded in the Old Testament of a character not in harmony with the general principles that characterize the exercise of superhuman power in other cases, it suggests the *possibility of interpolation*. Most of us have no doubt always thought of the passage of the Red Sea as having been effected calmly, the waters quietly parting as Moses waved the rod. Yet our faith is not endangered when we come to perceive that Dean Swift is in all probability right in supposing that it took place amid a hurricane of wind; the sea roaring as it was driven back, and the darkness being lit up by streaks of lightning. Certain miracles said to have been wrought by Elisha, such as the healing of the waters of Jericho, *at the request of the men of the city*, so that dearth or barrenness should not be there any more (2 Kings ii. 19-22), and the return to life of a man accidentally cast into the prophets' sepulchre, when the corpse touched Elisha's bones (2 Kings xiii. 21); the cursing of those who mocked him, and the consequent destruction of forty-two young men (not little children) by two she-bears (2 Kings ii. 23, 24); the making iron to swim, in order that one of the sons of the prophet might secure a borrowed ax. (2 Kings vi. 5), these miracles seem to us to be unworthy of divine interference. In one case the miracle seems to be wrought to meet the wishes of men seeking their own advantage; in

another, for no object whatever, beyond mere wonder-working ; in another, to carry out what certainly looks like vindictive revenge for personal insult ; in the last, to save the cost of a small purchase. In relation to the New Testament, there is probably but one miracle that is fairly questionable, that of the supposed periodical descent of an angel into the pool of Bethesda. And this is rejected by believing critics, on precisely the same grounds as those that have been stated, — its obvious improbability. It is improbable, because Josephus, who would only have been too proud to boast of this mark of the divine favor to the Jews, makes no mention of it.

The dogma of the eternal sensitive suffering of those who are unconverted *here*, which has descended to us from the apostasy, has, we firmly believe, no place in the word of God : it is, at the best, but a human and very inaccurate theological inference, even on the doctrine of the trinity — for the word itself is not Scriptural. Much has been said and written which can find no sanction in the Bible.

To speak of "God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost ; of three persons, but one God," — and such like, however needful in scholastic controversy, or whatever amount of truth they may embody, cannot be justified by apostolic habits of thought and expression. These phrases too often occasion the very evil they are intended to meet, and very frequently distress and perplex tender souls by creating difficulties which would otherwise never be felt. "But fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

UNDER the head of "Prophecies," Dr. Bellows thus refers to ancient Tyre :—

We thought over the twenty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel, which so boldly and eloquently predicted the ruin of this proud city, which had already in the prophet's days become a synonym for luxury, prosperity, and worldliness. The book-makers all would have us believe that the prophecies in regard to the destruction of these cities that border on their sacred land were verified with the most literal fidelity, and that every line of them had a special application and specific fulfilment. The real truth is, that the destruction of all great cities is certain, if only time enough is given ; and that a thousand years might usually be trusted to blot out the foundations of any town, or to build them over with a new city. A few cities retain their names after thrice as long a period, but they retain nothing else. Damascus, the oldest city in the world, is a city a dozen times rebuilt, and very often destroyed. Tyre has been destroyed and rebuilt and revived at least five times. To which of its destructions are the words of Ezekiel to be applied ? The noble indignation of the prophet, venting his solemn sense of the destruction that waits on all the pride of this world upon prosperous Tyre, would have been just as carefully fulfilled if applied to any other sea-coast city which had reached prosperity. It

is of the providential nature of civilizations, as the world changes its wants, and starts new types of life on fresh soils, to decay ; and no virtue or piety will save them from this fate ultimately. It is as certain as death for every man. The great thing for communities to reflect upon is the temporal and short-lived character of their proudest works and their mightiest power, and the importance of using their span to leave a noble legacy of experience and a grand heritage of truth and worth behind them, on which their posterity may build better for the race. Tyre and Sidon were great and noble communities for their age, and they rocked in their narrow cradles — these small and choked-up harbors — the commerce which at length occupies all oceans with its mighty wings. They deserved, doubtless, the warnings, reproofs, and threatenings they received from the holy men who prophesied their downfall ; but it certainly required no miraculous vision to announce for them the certainty of a catastrophe which is universal, and sooner or later falls on all great nations and great cities.

The "Watchman and Reflector," quoting the above, makes the following comment : —

Had "Volney's Ruins" contained the above paragraph, instead of Dr. Bellows's letters, it would have read very naturally and very properly. Yet we suppose Dr. B. would hardly allow that he represents the same school of infidelity with the distinguished French skeptic. But the above would be a poor vindication against such a charge.

While reading these remarks, it seemed to us that the editors of this paper might also be classed with this 'same school of infidelity,' by some pious person of another religion, whose sacred stories they are themselves daily in the habit of discrediting. How easy it is to believe our own side, and to trace the footprints of God where we were early told that he had passed ! If we cross over to the other side, we can see nothing. If those there cross to our side, they, too, see nothing. A stranger to both sides would see nothing in either place. We should then all unite in calling him 'infidel.' Perchance he would tell us of still another side, — his side, — and recount to us legends more wonderful than our own. He would talk of *faith*. Alas ! we would pick his story to pieces, deny it outright, or offer a rational interpretation. How natural, then, for him to turn upon us, saying, "You represent the same school of infidelity with the distinguished skeptic, Von Blinkerdam" !

The "Reflector" would hardly allow it, but so the fact would stand.

AN answer to Mr. E. C. Stedman's poem, 'The Undiscovered Country,' in "The Round Table" of May.

HOPE.

A RESPONSE TO "THE UNDISCOVERED COUNTRY."

We cannot know
 Aught of that far-off realm by us named heaven,
 Where, in our fancy, lilies pure as snow
 Fleck all the emerald meadows which are riven
 By wondrous singing streams. We cannot know
 Until we go.

We may not tell
 If our freed spirit, searching, shall discover
 The kindred souls of those we loved so well,
 Who, when they passed death's midnight river over,
 Passed speechless and alone. We may not tell,
 Nor yet rebel.

Have we not left
 That grand impulse to every great endeavor
 Which swathes the broken hearts by partings cleft?
 Hope, skyward, burns its beacon-light forever,
 Beckoning us towards the truth: this we have left
 Who are bereft.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION, held in Boston, May 28 and 29, 1868. Boston: Adams & Co. pp. 120.

The principal feature of the meeting on the 28th was the "Report of the Executive Committee," by W. J. Potter, secretary of the association. Mr. Potter opens with the following statement:—

"The Executive Committee of the Free Religious Association, in presenting their first annual report, have little to recount in the way of visible practical work, either accomplished or projected. Nor was it to be expected that from an organization so novel in its idea and purpose, so large and inclusive in its scope, and so designedly free and spontaneous in its plan,

The Radical.

any very definite and tangible results should be manifest in a single year. It were better even that the association should appear to have done nothing, than that anything should have been done, through a natural impatience to produce some immediate and visible effect, that would have tended to narrow its basis and injure its capacity for a larger and grander work in the future. . . .

"Yet, though your committee are not able to report any great scheme of work completed or undertaken, they have not been idle; nor have they been unmindful of the important responsibility of the trust committed to them. . . . They have been thoughtful observers of public religious events and tendencies, and quite an extensive correspondence has been begun, which must every year increase, with persons interested in the general objects of the association in all sections of the United States, and also to some extent with persons in England and in India."

Mr. Potter refers to a course of lectures given at Cambridge; to an effort being made to procure "the publication of a volume of essays (somewhat after the manner of the English 'Essays and Reviews'); which would represent the progressive and advanced religious thought in this country."

Mr. Potter remarks, "Since we have so little of *achievement* to record, it may be well in this first report to speak somewhat of *capabilities*;" and under this head he proceeds to speak first of 'the *objects* of the Association as stated in the first article of the constitution."

"We are organized," he says, "according to that article, to promote the interest of pure religion, to encourage the scientific study of theology, and to increase fellowship in the spirit. But we fail to perceive the full bearing of this language, unless we note that this statement of purpose is introduced by the title of the association, which is "*Free Religious*," and is followed by an invitation to '*all persons* interested in these objects' to become members. The basis of the association, therefore, is broader than anything before attempted in the way of organization in religious history. It goes below any one specific form of religion, and seeks to find the common ground on which all religions, or, more properly, religion itself, rests, and plants itself there. It contemplates the ultimate union, not simply of all sects in Christendom, but of all religions, Christian and non-Christian, in one. It looks beyond "Christian" limits for its fellowship. Nor is this aim, even thus early, only ideal. As the meetings last year and this both testify, it is in a measure already realized. And this fact, with what it involves, is the most distinguishing feature of the association. 'With what it involves;' for the important thing is not so much the fact that the association brings different sects and religions together on one platform, as the principle underlying that fact. This principle is, that in this association these various religious opinions and faiths meet and mingle *on perfectly equal terms*, no one claiming for itself what it does not cordially accord, by courtesy and by right, to every other. For the first time in religious history, not only representatives of differing Christian sects, but people of all religious names and of no religious name, are invited to come together as equal brothers, and confer with one another on the highest interests of mankind. Most of us here are probably, by reason of birth and education, counted in the census of the world's population as 'Christian,' whether we make any other claim to the name or not. But on the platform of this association we do not obtrude that title. We agree here to listen to what our Hebrew friend may have to utter, or what our India brother may write to us, of their respective religious faiths, with the same candor and the same integrity and openness of judgment that we accord to a

Christian speaker. A believer in the Christian system of religion may, if his conscience so dictate, use his right to speak on the platform of this association with the purpose of proving the claims of his particular faith paramount to all others, and of converting non-believers to his views; but, if he does so, that very act commits him to hear impartially the same claims made for any other faith. One who should come here simply to speak with dogmatic and sectarian arrogance for his own belief, and not cordially to listen to what might be said in behalf of another belief, would not come certainly in the spirit of the constitution of this association.

Yet this is not to say that the Free Religious Association takes the ground that one form of religion or of faith is as true and good as another. It simply does not determine the claims of any specific form of faith, or assume the claims of any to be determined. It declines to consider it a closed question that the claims of any religion, are to be regarded as finally established, and gives a fair, open field for the establishing of any religion, or of so much of any religion as can prove itself to be true. Christianity, thus far, has attempted to convert all other religions to itself. The Christian missionary goes to India, and says to the natives there, 'You must be converted to my faith, or there is no hope of your progress to anything better in this world or of your happiness in the world to come.' This association says to these native religious devotees, 'Let us see what is true in your religion, and what is true in this and that other form of faith, and be ready to accept the true from any quarter; and meantime, let us put our heads together, and see if we cannot contrive some better and worthier ways of living.' The Free Religious Association simply does not accept any instituted form of religion as necessarily a finality. It admits the possibility of advance in religious truth beyond any present religious system. It plants itself on *Truth-seeking*, and does not claim to have found a finality in religious faith and practice."

The report concludes with discussing the proper *instrumentalities* for the work of the association.

The morning session held in Tremont Temple on the following day was remarkable in many respects, and illustrated the idea of a general gathering of the representatives of many phases of religious belief. The opening address of the president, Mr. Octavius B. Frothingham, is in a vein similar to Mr. Potter's report. He discussed the *objects* of the association, and defined the terms *religious* and *free*, making some statements which at once gave the key-note to the discussion that followed. He said: —

"We are a *religious* association; not political, not social, primarily; not philanthropic, not reformatory in the specific sense of these words, nor yet are we technically 'Christian.' In the middle age, when the world was smaller, what Renan says may have been true, — that Christianity and religion were synonymous terms; but in this new world, with its developing resources, its multiplying population, its newly discovered mines of thought, and its immense expanse of activity, this can no longer be said with truth. 'Christianity' is a sect. It is not only one of several great religions, but it includes only one portion of the humanity which is not included in those great religions. There are vast multitudes of people, not only in our own America, but in Europe, in Asia, and in India, as well, who are not comprised in Christendom, and never will be. Jews are not 'Christians'; Mussulmen are not 'Christians'; the Rationalists are not 'Christians'; multitudes of Spiritualists are not 'Christians'; great numbers of scientific men are not 'Christians'; vast numbers of reformers, who are interested

in social science, and in the general social progress of humanity, will not call themselves 'Christians.'"

In speaking of *freedom*, Mr. Frothingham said : —

" We say freedom is not Jewish, is not Mohammedan, is not Christian : it is simply **FREEDOM** ; it is **HUMAN**. To be *free* is to be at liberty to follow the laws of thought ; and so when we call this a *free* religious association, we mean to say it is an association which puts no limits whatever on human thought, so it be earnest, so it be truth-seeking ; and we do not undertake to say whether it is truth-seeking or not."

Farther along, he adds this important statement, which, we perceive in the proceedings that followed, was not well observed : —

" Not simply freedom of discussion, not freedom of debate, not freedom of quarrel ; we do not open here a gladiatorial arena ; we would put an end to all that. There is fighting enough now ; there has been fighting enough before. Freedom of *discussion* implies partial freedom. When people are just free enough to be able to come with their swords and clear a little place round about them, where they can stand face to face with their adversary, and fight on equal terms, each fighting for life, that is but partial freedom : but when there is no opprobrium, no reproof cast upon any, no ill word spoken of any ; when one is externally as free to be an Atheist as to be a Theist, to be a Materialist as to be a Spiritualist, to be a Christian as to be a non-Christian or an anti-Christian ; when one is perfectly free to sit down with any company, — with publicans and sinners if he will, without having any ugly name of "Atheist" or "Infidel" flung in his face, then we have freedom, — freedom of contribution ; polemics are no more ; debate is disarmed ; controversy is at an end ; we are not enemies ; we have nothing to do with swords and pistols ; we are friends ; we are brothers."

Mr. Frothingham introduced, during the morning session, James Freeman Clarke, Robert Collyer, Charles H. Malcolm, John P. Hubbard, Olympia Brown, and John Weiss, thus exhibiting different shades of Unitarianism, a view from a liberal Baptist point, an Episcopalian photograph of sin and redemption, a plea by a lady of the Universalist persuasion for "Christian work," and a specimen of Radical impassioned eloquence. It is pleasing to read the following as indicating the spirit of the Baptist brother : —

" So we who are here this morning come here, I think, as seekers. We leave behind us, for this brief hour, at least all ecclesiastical barriers and hindrances, and with honest hearts open our souls to the whisperings of the divine spirit, and our eyes to the illuminations of that Deity who in every age and in every land reveals himself to the devout and hungering soul."

In contrast with this spirit might be mentioned the remarks of James Freeman Clarke, who did not "know exactly why he was invited," but finally attacked the platform of the Free Religionists with vigorous, though, as it would seem from all that transpired thereon afterwards, ineffectual, blows. He was an "Orthodox Unitarian" and a "Christian." The president had said that Christianity was to be regarded upon their platform as *one* of the religions, having only equal rights. Mr. Clarke's

speech takes issue on this point, insisting that Christianity is *the only religion*, a religion including the good there is in all other systems. It is manifest that the "Free Religious Association" could not act upon this notion, since it would have reduced their scheme to a partisan effort at once, with Dr. Clarke, perhaps, as their only prophet. Neither Malcom nor Hubbard could have joined him in defending what *he* found Christianity to be, nor could he have gone over to them. Neither Jew nor Gentile could have remained.

There occurs in Mr. Hubbard's speech a strange allusion to the "testimony" of Napoleon as to the "divinity of Christ." Napoleon is quoted as comparing his own and the efforts of Alexander, Cæsar, and Charlemagne, to found kingdoms, with the peculiar effort of Jesus. They had relied on "force," and failed. "Jesus alone founded his empire upon love." *Therefore*, concludes Napoleon, Jesus was God, and not man; and Mr. Hubbard deems the argument conclusive testimony.

The speech of Mr. Weiss, which is reported to have redeemed the morning session from the monotony of much declamation and mere debate, we shall reprint in **THE RADICAL** next month.

From the afternoon session we have a report by Mr. Potter on "Present Tendencies of Society in regard to Religious Organization and Worship," and speeches by T. W. Higginson, Caroline H. Dall, C. C. Burleigh, J. M. Peebles, A. M. Powell, F. E. Abbot, A. B. Alcott. Glancing at the close of Mr. Burleigh's speech, we read the following:—

"We were told here this morning, that liberty may be too large for efficiency, and some illustrations were given us to impress the conviction of the truth of that statement upon our minds. We were told, for example, that steam is never powerful until it is confined. We should have been told, also, that it is never efficient as long as it is confined, and that it is only when it is rushing for liberty that it begins to be effective, only when struggling to be free that it ever does anything. We were told that the air which resists the wings of the mountain bird is necessary to sustain them. Ay; but the air which sustains them yields on every side to every impulse of the will which is driving the wing through it. That is the kind of law which we recognize as coincident with liberty; a law which is pliant and flexible to the impulse of the mighty powers of free will, using whatsoever is around it at once to sustain and give vigor to its force, and enable it to give right direction to that vigor."

Mr. Alcott said among other things:—

I believe that the highest thought is most easily carried into practice, and that, the more transcendent our ideas, the more perfect our action. Therefore let me say, that I wish to see all these fine thoughts, these admirable hopes, which we have had to-day from all varieties of the American mind, carried into action. I wish to see them organized. I wait to see the first movement which looks beyond thought to action. I wish to have the head married to the hand; I wish to have the heart move head and hand. Let me speak, then, about the instrumentalities. Let us avail ourselves of all of them. Let not any suggestion from any sect pass by us unheeded. Do you not see how Catholics, how conservative Unitarians, are stealing our thunder? — that they are watching us, and getting in advance of us, in their movements? Do you not see that the theatre movement is ours? Do

you not see that the Roman Catholic's hope to make all our country Catholic is stolen from us? The highest thought drives the world. And do you not see that those who come up here to-day, come with the belief that here is the altar, and here is the divine fire at which our hearts are to be lighted? Therefore, I say, accept every suggestion from all sides. Begin with music, the highest instrumentality there is. Were we not touched to-day by the strains we heard? Did the eloquence of my friend, even, who closed the morning session, thrill us more than the simple strains of this choir? Begin with music, and charm the heart to divinity. Then take conversation. Do not look to the platform and to large audiences alone. Do not look to the convention and to eloquent speeches. If you will have work done, begin at home. Speak the simple, earnest, transcendent, precious thought in the parlor. Begin with small circles, — your families, your neighbors, your friends, — and give utterance. Then take the larger circle of the convention; then take the broader anniversary, like this; then have your newspaper, your periodical. Let not any one of these instrumentalities be let alone. Seize them all. Take them.

From the evening session, we have speeches by T. W. Higginson, Wendell Phillips, Lizzie Doten, the "Closing Address of the President," and a Report by F. B. Sanborn on "The Religious Duty of Philanthropy and Social Reform." We have only space for the remark by the President that "the Association under whose auspices this meeting was called, must feel satisfied now that they have an idea, a truth, a position, and a work to do, which they would be entirely unjustified in leaving undone."

Of quite as much interest as anything we have noticed, are the letters to be found in the "Appendix" from Keshub Chunder Sen (Secretary Brahmo Somaj of India), and Moncure D. Conway with regard to religious movements in England.

S. H. M.

A DEFENCE OF VIRGINIA (and through her of the South), IN RECENT AND PENDING CONTESTS AGAINST THE SECTIONAL PARTY. By PROF. R. L. DABNEY, D. D., of Virginia, late of the Confederate Army. New York: E. Z. Hale & Son.

It is much to be regretted that the title of this book should be so hopelessly fatal to a wide circulation at the North. Very few, of the least radical tendency, would be tempted to peep between covers so unpromising; and yet this volume is a very able advocate of the cause which it professedly attacks. The reverend gentleman, its author, has unwittingly done good service for the party which he stigmatizes as standing on "anti-scriptural, infidel, and radical ground." "For, as we shall evince, the word of God is on our side, and the teachings of abolitionism are clearly of rationalistic origin, of infidel tendency, and only sustained by reckless and licentious (!) perversions of the meaning of the sacred text. It will in the end become apparent to the world, not only that the conviction of the wickedness of slave-holding was drawn wholly from sources foreign to the Bible, but that it is a legitimate corollary from that fantastic, atheistic, and radical theory of human rights, which made the reign of terror in France; which has threatened that country, and which now threatens the United States, with the horrors of Red Republicanism." With this preface begins

a long defence of the system of slave-holding: first Dr. Dabney proves from history that Virginia never was guilty of the sin of trading in slaves, and heaps that infamy on Massachusetts's head; then he proves from the Bible, that Virginia, in holding slaves thrust upon her, has followed the word of God, and that Massachusetts, in begetting abolitionism, has been guilty of a second heinous sin in the same direction. And we must allow that the professor in both cases makes his point. The historical evidence in regard to the early condition of the two states cannot be gainsaid, and that it was a shameful and sinful traffic, we of Massachusetts are eager to admit. Then he shifts his ground from the past to the present, and his arguments from the present to the past, from English and American to Biblical history. "It is our purpose," he says, "to argue this proposition i. e., that slavery is the righteous, the best, yea, the only tolerable, relation for the African race, on Bible grounds. Our people and our national neighbors are professedly Christians: the vast majority of them profess to get their ideas of morality, as all should, from the sacred Scriptures. A few speculative minds may derive moral conclusions from ethical principle, but the masses derive their ideas of right and wrong from a 'Thus saith the Lord.'" And accordingly, with a very great command of references and quotations, he begins with the Old Testament to show that slavery in those times was a thing ordained and blessed of the Lord, in the nation he had set apart for a holy people. Dr. Dabney agrees that everything enjoined upon the Hebrews is not necessarily enjoined upon us; yet every such thing must be innocent in its nature, or God would not have enjoined it upon his chosen race. Then he steps over to the Christian era, and proves—if superabundance of instances be proof—that Christ at least tolerated, saw no sin in, slave-holding, if he did not expressly sanction it. The Professor says that Christ and Dr. Channing were not of one mind upon the subject. We can only say, with profoundest reverence for that life which shines steadily down to us through the dimness of so many hundred years, that we do not believe that Christ was less true of moral vision in any direction than Dr. Channing. St. Paul comes to the reverend gentleman's rescue, with his lists of damnable sins, in which yet slave-holding has no place. The Doctor is triumphant. There seems to be no refuting the fact that in those days the temporal and moral law (dimly known) sanctioned the institution. And it is just here, that, with delightful unconsciousness, he strikes a blow for the Radical cause. "To every mind which reverences the Inspiration of the Old Testament it is conclusive. And let every Christian note that with the Inspiration of the Old Testament stands or falls that of Christ and the apostles, because they commit themselves irretrievably to the support of the former." So that the whole book is a learned, labored, and to every Christian mind, as says its author, a conclusive argument that a belief in the infallibility of the Scriptures hangs upon a belief in the righteousness of slave-holding! It is but a slender thread to hold so great an interest. But would to God the whole world were of Dr. Dabney's opinion! Let the thread break: it is not to

fall into God's open arms. Too often it is, not until this doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible be given up, that one learns the infallibility of God; giving up, with bitter tears it may be, and strong despairs, the dogma of the old plenary inspiration, limited to that time, and reaching a divine sense of the eternal presence and constant inspiration of the Father.

The style of the book is bombastic and inflated; the use of English very arbitrary. The bitterness of the "unreconstructed" is everywhere apparent.

* *

LITTLE WOMEN ; or, MEG, JO, BETH, AND AMY. By LOUISA M. ALCOTT. Illustrated by MAY ALCOTT. Boston : Roberts Brothers. 1868. pp. 341.

A CHARMING book for the girls and boys. Is full of capital hits, of children's expectations, of sorry times and happy times, such as all children have; times sad enough to break their hearts, or gay enough for any heaven. It is instructive withal, without being dull and moralizing. A good book for the new year. On page 249, "Jo" has a letter to "My Precious Marmee," which she closes with "A Song from the Suds." She says: "I made a 'pome' yesterday, when I was helping Hannah wash; and as father likes my silly little things, I put it in to amuse him." We will quote her 'pome,' that 'Little Women' generally may read it.

" Queen of my tub, I merrily sing
While the white foam rises high ;
And sturdily wash and rinse and wring,
And fasten the clothes to dry ;
Then out in the free fresh air they swing,
Under the summer sky.

" I wish we could wash from our hearts and souls
The stains of the week away ;
And let water and air, by their magic, make
Ourselves as pure as they :
Then on the earth there would be indeed
A glorious washing-day !

" Along the path of a useful life
Will heart's-ease ever bloom :
The busy mind has no time to think
Of sorrow or care or gloom ;
And anxious thoughts may be swept away,
As we busily wield a broom.

" I am glad a task to me is given
To labor at day by day ;
For it brings me health and strength and hope,
And I cheerfully learn to say,
' Head you may think, Heart you may feel,
But Hand you shall work alway ! '

The illustrations of the book are striking and pleasing.

S. H. M.

LIFE AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF GENERAL ULYSSES S. GRANT, from his Boyhood to the Present Time. And a Biographical Sketch of Hon. Schuyler Colfax. By Charles A. Phelps. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1868. pp. 341.

Making due allowance for its being a "campaign" publication, this book yet furnishes very interesting sketches of Grant and Colfax. Opening it to read anew of the "Capture of Fort Donelson," of the doubtful issue of the two days' hard fighting, and the victory that rewarded the heroic perseverance of the "boys in blue" under Grant on the third, the famous despatch of Grant's to Buckner, "*I propose to move immediately upon your works*," stimulates the hope, that, with his election to the chief public office of the country, he will revive this old spirit, and re-animate the country once more with the same assuring voice. As the almost daily reports come to our ears of the wretched condition of affairs at the South, the massacre of negroes and of white Union men, it seems a long time to the fourth day of March next. But if Grant's "let us have peace" means, as it will if the rank and file of the Republican party are not greatly mistaken in him, "*I propose to move immediately upon your works; I demand an unconditional and immediate surrender*, and this time for *good*, gentlemen of the South," — we are sure of the end, whatever shocking event shall take place meantime.

There is much in the character of Gen. Grant to suggest the tribute forced from Hannibal in his contests with the Roman general, Marcellus. "Ye gods! what can we do with a man who is not affected with either good or bad fortune? This is the only man who will neither give any time to rest when he is victorious, nor take any when he is beaten. We must even resolve to fight with him forever; since, whether prosperous or unsuccessful, a principle of honor leads him on to new attempts and further exertions of courage."

If the now half-restored spirit of rebellion against human nature, in whose interests our fathers declared they hoped to found a government, finds in Grant one who answers this description of the Roman general, we shall have an administration of affairs which the exigency demands, which history will allow to stand as the crowning achievement of the long struggle. American credit will be redeemed and established upon a basis of free and enduring peace.

S. H. M.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, chiefly during the years 1863-65. By H. P. Liddon, M. A. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1868. pp. 291.

The tone of these 'sermons' indicates the desire of Mr. Liddon to have them serve as a stay to the sweeping waves of modern Rationalism. He makes no direct issue, but rather re-states the old doctrines in the hope of making them clear and attractive. One finds a thoughtful vein running through the entire book, and portions of much beauty; many vigorous statements, which, though he may not allow to have the same force their

author intended for them, are yet attractive, and suggest their opposite, at times, so clearly to the mind, it is more profitable to read Mr. Liddon than most writers upon the other side.

Of course most of Mr. Liddon's thoughts circle around the "Scriptures." He works his texts, and makes many Biblical references. But beyond this he calls to his aid much matter of interest from all sources. He treats of "God and the Soul," "Immortality," the "Law of Progress," the "Freedom of the Spirit," and, among other pertinent topics, of the "Conflict with Pride of Intellect." Under this head, Mr. Liddon speaks of the "fall," and remarks that that event "did not merely deprive human nature of the light of grace," but "so distorted the original structure of our nature as to make reason generally the slave of passion instead of its master." "Reason which exalts itself against revelation is often in reality not free intellect, but intellect working at the secret bidding of an irritated passion." This is a curious phrase; at least, it is very much mixed up. What Mr. Liddon means to say, undoubtedly, is, that we exalt reason oftentimes above "revelation" because we are "irritated by passion,"—by pride, which will not allow us to accept of mystery at the intellect's expense. If we would humble the intellect enough, revelations (mystery) would receive from us all the privileges demanded for it by Mr. Liddon, and the class of thinkers to which he belongs. His argument is, free intellect is reverent, and yielding to revelation. Natural intellect, (enslaved intellect) in a variety of forms contests the claims of revelation at every point. "What revelation does Mr. Liddon mean?" one might ask by good right; though, of course, we all know he refers to that revelation which his own *free* intellect has discovered to be of God. We say this only because it must needs be so, else he himself were opposed to revelation, not that we suppose his intellect is any more *free* than that of a great many others who set what he regards as revelation wholly aside; it may be from pride, but a pride in the resources of the intellect is not, surely, the lowest or worst of evils. Pride may restrain the intellect from debasing itself; or it may limit it to its present achievements, persuading it that it already has won the goal of all truth. Which would be best? It is the latter thing which, it appears to us, pride has done for Mr. Liddon: it has made him an egotist of his very limitations,—proud in his humility of a revelation that has cost him nothing but a readiness to rely on a mystery he "apprehends," but does not, and cannot, "comprehend." He enumerates many things which reason can do, and then asks, "What knows she of the inner life of God as he has opened it to *us* believing Christians in the august doctrine of the holy trinity?" "What has she that can meet the needs of the soul of man, as they are met by Christian doctrines of the atoning death and mediatorial work of Jesus Christ?" The pride of humility certainly reigns in these sentences if anywhere.

S. H. M.